# THE ANATOMIE OF THE MASSE.

Wherein is shewed by the Holy Scriptures, and by the testimony of the Ancient Church, that the Masse is contrary unto the Word of God, and farre from the way of Salvation.

By PETER du MOULIN, Doctor and Professor in Divinity.

And Translated into English, By JAMES MOUNTAINE.

LONDON.

Printed by *J.B.* for *Humphrey Robinson*, and are to be sold at his Shop, at the Signe of the three *Pigeons* in *Pauls Church-Yard*. 1641.

Imprimatur,

*Tho: Wykes R. P. Episc. Lond. Capell. Domest.*

TO

# The Right Honourable and most Illustrious Lords:

*The Earle* *The*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| of | Bedford. | *Viscount* | *Say and* Seale. |
| | Hartford. | | Savile. |
| | Essex. | *Lord* | Wharton. |
| | Warwick. | | Brooke. |

RIGHT HONOVRABLE,

GOD *having been pleased not to suffer my heart to be much enamoured with worldly preferments & imployes of that nature, whereby I have possessed my soule in quietnesse and enjoyed more liberty: In acknowledgement of that favour, and being perswaded withall that God hath not weaned me from these pleasures for to*

*sit still & to be idle: my chiefe studie hath been, according to my poore ability, to busie my mind and to apply my heart to spirituall things, which might both better my selfe and others, and make me (if not so rich and so considerable in this life, yet (I am sure) through God his free mercy) rich and eminent enough in the life to come. Wherefore, in the prosecution of that holy resolution, after severall Works of this nature which by Gods providence I have given to the publick in the French tongue, and which (I may say it truly & without vanity) have not been without fruit: It hath pleased the same divine Wisdome to put into my heart to give unto this Pious Nation, this little work in their owne language. And forasmuch as your Honours are of the eminentest of the kingdome, and of the maineſt and principal Pillars, which, under your most Pious and most Gratious Soveraigne, uphold both this Church and Common wealth: & furthermore, seeing also that all the eyes of this florishing Nation (grounded upon that assured knowledge it hath of your fervent Love to GOD, Loyalty to your*

PRINCE,

PRINCE, and tender affection to your Countrey) are now fixed upon you as upon so many Moses standing in the gap between them and Gods threatning judgements: I have thought my selfe bound in duty (having so faire an opportunity as this is) to crowd among the rest into your presence, and to shew as wel as others, this publick and true testimony of my most humble respects, in presenting first with all humility this poore labour of mine unto your Honors, joyntly: being unwilling (so long as I finde divers presidents of the like dedications) to divide and separate those whom GOD and the KING have joyned together: beseeching you to accept of it; to vouchsafe it your Patronage, and to beare in its forefront your Honourable Names. I presume that for the Author his sake, your Honors will not deny me that favour. And the rather, because it tends to the same end that yee aime at, to wit Gods Glory, and the furtherance of True Religion. For, Most Illustrious Lords, I have beene an eye-witnesse above this eighteen years, of that Constant Zeale and Exemplary Pietie

which is so resplendent in your Honors. And oftentimes being ravished in admiration to see such extraordinary gifts & graces in such great Persons, notwithstanding the corruption of the times: I have blessed God heartily for it, and prayed his Divine Majestie to powre more and more upon your Lordships, the dew of his heavenly graces unto the end. And indeed, Right Honourable, to conclude this in a word, I can attest upon mine owne knowledge of that eighteen yeares standing: that although your Honours doe live here among men, your conversation hath been for the most part with God: neglecting no meanes (for all your great and weighty occasions) to waite and attend upon his service, in his holy Courts and Sanctuaries. But alas, all that I can say in that behalfe, is but as a drop of water throwne into the vast Ocean. And therefore, Right Honorable, I must crave leave to say no more: and aske pardon that I have said so little, and so far short of what your Honors deserve.

As for the Author and worke, I should say something too, if he and his workes were

were not better knowne than I can expresse, Yet I will say this by the way, that he hath been, is, (and long may hee be) one of the Worthiest and most powerfull Instruments in Gods hand for the conversion of Soules, destruction of Babel, and rearing up of Bethel; as this Age hath afforded. And for this particular worke of his, it shall suffice me to say (to give it the highest commendation I can) that it is Peter du Moulins.

Finally, Right Honourable, I should say something also touching my selfe: which shall bee onely to beseech againe your Lordships to be pleased to Pardon the boldnesse of a poore stranger, in dedicating this small book, and first fruits of his (that have seene the light in the English tongue) unto your Honours: excuse the defects that may be found in the same, (though I hope you shall finde it faithfully translated, and free from any grosse barbarismes in the Language:) and to attribute that excesse of temeritie, to the excesse of the honour I beare unto your Lordships: for whom I shall never cease to call upon God for an en-

crease of Honor and long Prosperity here on Earth, untill that being full of dayes, and having finished your course in his feare, yee receive that Crowne of glory which is laid up for you in Heaven.

And so, fearing to be too tedious and troublesome unto your Honours: I humbly take my leave and rest,

Most Renowned Lords

Your most humble and most devoted servant.

JAM: MOUNTAINE

# A TABLE OF THE CHAPTERS.

## FIRST BOOKE.

Chap. I. *The Institution of the holy Supper, by our Lord Jesus Christ, as it is contained in the first Epistle of the Apostle Saint* Paul *to the* Corinthians, *Chapter* 11. page 1.

Chap. II. *Foure and thirty contrarieties betweene the holy Supper and the Masse. And how farre the Church of* Rome *is departed from the institution of the Lord.* pag. 3.

Chap. III. *How the change in the Lords Institution, hath changed the nature of the Sacrament, And that in the Masse there is no consecration.* 24.

Chap. IV. *That by altering the Lords Institution, the Romane Church hath changed the nature of Christ.* 26.

Chap. V. *Of* Maldonat *his audaciousnesse in giving Saint* Paul *and Saint* Luke *the lie: and in correcting Saint* Matthew *and* Mark: *And of the fruit of the Vine.* 30.

Chap. VI. *How much Christ is dishonoured by this Doctrine. And of the character indelible: And of the power of creating ones Creator.* 35.

Cap.

Chap. VII. *That the very words of the Masse are contrary to Transubstantiation.* 41.

Chap. VIII. *Recrimination of our Adversaries.* 43.

Chap. IX. *Causes why the Pope admitteth not of any alteration in the Masse, and will not conforme himselfe to the Lords Institution.* 45.

Chap. X. *Places wherein the Doctors and Councels of the Roman Church maintaine, that the Pope and the Church of* Rome *are not subject to the Scripture, and have greater authority than the Scripture, and may make voide and abolish the Commandements of God.* 46.

Chap. XI. *That our Exposition of these words* This is my body, *is conformable to the Scripture and to the nature of Sacraments, and approved by the ancient Fathers, and confirmed by our Adversaries.* 55.

Chap. XII. *That our adversaries, to avoide a cleare and natural figure, forge a multitude of harsh and unusuall ones, and speake but in figurative tearmes. And of* Berengarius *his confession.* 63.

Chap. XIII. *Of the Ascension of the Lord, and of his absence: and of that our Adversaries say, that in the Sacrament he is Sacramentally present.* 68.

Chap. XIV. *Confession of our Adversaries, acknowledging that Transubstantiation is not grounded in the Scriptures. That the Primitive*

Church did consecrate by the Prayer, and not by these words, This is my body. 76.

Chap. XV. *Of the adoration of the Sacrament. The opinion of the* Roman *Church.* 82.

Chap. XVI. *Examen of the Adoration of the Sacrament by the word of God. That the ancient Christians did not worship the Sacrament.* 88.

Chap. XVII. *Of the Priests intention, without which the* Roman *Church beleeveth no consecration, nor Transubstantiation is made* 96.

Chap. XVIII. *That our Adversaries, in this matter, intangle themselves into absurdities and insoluble contradictions.* 104

Chap. XIX. *Of accidents without a subject. Places of Fathers.* 117.

Chap. XX. *Answers to some examples brought out of the Scriptures by our Adversaries. for to prove that the body of Christ hath beene sometimes in two severall places.* 122.

Chap. XXI. *Of the dignity of Priests. And that our Adversaries debase and vilifie the utility and efficacy of Masses, and make them unprofitable for the remission of sinnes. And of the traffick of Masses.* 126

Chap. XXII. *That the* Roman *Religion is a new Religion, and forged for the Popes profit and of the Clergies.* 138.

Chap. XXIII. *Answer to the question made unto us by our Adversaries, Where was your Religion before* Calvin. 146.

Chap.

Chap. XXIV. *That our Adversaries do reject the Fathers, and speake of them with contempt.* 161

Chap. XXV. *Of the corruption and falsification of the Fathers Workes: and of the difficulty to understand them.* 169.

Chap. XXVI. *Places of the Fathers, contrary to Transubstantiation, & to the manducation of the body of Christ by the corporall mouth.* 175.

Chap. XXVII. *Confirmation of the same, by the custome of the Ancient Church.* 197.

Chap. XXVIII. *Explanation of the places of the Fathers, that say that in the Eucharist we eate the body and blood of Christ, and that the bread is changed into the body of Christ, and is made Christs body. Specially of* Ambrose, Hilary, *and* Chrysostome. *That the Fathers doe speake of severall kindes of body and blood of Christ.* 200.

Chap. XXIX. *That divers ancient Fathers have beleeved a mystical Union of the Godhead of Christ with the bread of the Sacrament.* 212.

Chap. XXX. *Particular opinion of Saint* Austin, *and of* Fulgentius, *and of* Innocent *the third.* 226.

Chap. XXXI. *That the Church of* Rome *condemning the Impanation, is fallen her selfe into an error a thousand times more pernicious, by Transubstantiation. And of the Adoration of the accidents of the bread.* 228.

Chap. XXXII. *That the Sacrifice of the Masse was not instituted by Christ. Confession of our Adversaries.* 231.

Chap. XXXIII. *That the Sacrifice of the Masse agrees neither with Scripture nor with reason.* 235

Chap. XXXIV. *In what sence the holy Supper may be called a Sacrifice. Of* Melchisedeks *sacrifice. And of the Oblation whereof* Malachy *speaketh.* 243.

Chap. XXXV. *In what sence the Fathers have called the Eucharist a sacrifice.* 247.

*The Second Booke.*

## OF THE MANDUCATION of the Body of Christ.

Chap. I. *OF two sorts of manducation of Christs flesh, to wit, the spirituall and corporall: and which is the best.* 253.

Chap. II. *That in the sixt of Saint* John, *the Lord speakes not of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, nor of the manducation of his flesh by the mouth of the body.* 260.

Chap. III. *That the Roman Church, by this doctrine, depriveth the People of salvation.* 269.

Chap. IV. *That the Principall Doctors of the Roman Church, yea the Popes themselves, doe agree*

*agree with us in this point: and hold that in the sixt of Saint* John *nothing is spoken but of the spirituall manducation; and that those that contradict them, doe speake with incertitude.* 274.

Chap. V. *Reasons of our Adversaries for to prove that in the sixt Chapter of Saint* John *it is spoken of the Manducation by the mouth of the body.* 280.

Chap. VI. *Testimonies of the Fathers.* 285.

Chap. VII. *Impiety of* Salmeron *the Iesuite, and of* Peter Charron. *And of* Bellarmins *foure men inclosed in one suite of clothes. That by this doctrine, Christ hath not a true body in the Sacrament.* 292.

Chap. VIII. *Of the progresse of this abuse, and by what meanes* Satan *hath established the Transubstantiation.* 298.

Chap. IX. *Of the judgement which the Doctors of the Roman Church doe make touching the apparitions, whereby a little Child, or a morsell of flesh hath appeared at the Masse in the hands of the Priest, and touching Christs blood that is kept in Reliques.* 312.

Chap. X. *Of the corruption of the Papall Sea in the Ages wherein this errour was most advanced.* 317.

Chap. XI. *Of the oppression of England. How Religion passed out of England into Bohemia. Of* Wickleef. *Of* John Huz, *and of*

of Hierome *of Prague. Of the Councell of* Constance. *Of* Ziſca *and* Procopius, *and of their Victories.* 323.

Chap. XII. *The Confeſſion of* Cyril *Patriarch of Conſtantinople, now living, touching the Sacrament of the Euchariſt.* 324.

## *ERRATA.*

Page 5. Line 3. Reade *any*. p.10.l.1. What is in the Margent muſt be in the Text. p.11.l.5.r. *of this bread*. p.28.l.2.r. *nor ſtirred*. and line 11.r. *Saviour*. p.68.l.8. r. *ſenſibly*. p.69.l.11.r. *chap.* 17.11. p.70.l.23.r. *word*. p. 76.l.15.r. *Doctor*. p.79.l.15.r. *Church*. p.105.l.10.r. *as if I ſhould ſay*. p.121.l.23.r. *of miraculous*. p.136.l. 18. *put a full point after foureſold*. p.145.l.20.r. *benefit*. p. 152. *from the 14 line to the 27 ſhould be Italica*. p.157. l.2.r. *yeare* 1512. p.177.l.21.r. *remained*. p.178.l.25.r. *For the old Paſſeover*. p.182.l.1.r. *Father*. p.186.l.2.r. *inviſible*. p.187.l.9.r. *Brethren*. p.194.l.2.r. *ſhould be made*. p.200.l.12.r. *three ſorts*. p.223.l.10.r. *thoſe of Ambroſe*. p.233.l.17.r. *acknowledgeth*. p 244.l.7.r. *alleadge*. p.248 l.12.r. *perfecting*. & l.23.r. *ſacrificed*. p.250.l.28. &. 30. r. *gifts*. p.253. Chap.1.r. *Of the two ſorts, &c*. p.282.l. 22.r. *of this chapter*. p.287.l.5. the word *even*, muſt be put in the next line, and read, *that even*, &c.

## CYPRIAN IN HIS LXIII. EPISTLE TO CÆCILIVS, §. 7. SPEAKING OF THE EVCHARISTICALL CVP.

*The holy Apostle teacheth that we must no manner of way swerve or depart from that which is commanded us in the Gospell, and that the Disciples ought to practise and doe the same things which the Master hath done and taught.*

## And in the XI §.

*If Christ must be heard alone, we ought not to regard what others before us have thought fitting to be done, but what Christ, who is before all, hath done first. For we must not follow the custome of man, but the will of God.*

## The Commentary upon the first to the Corinth. attributed to Saint Ambrose in the XI Chapter.

*The Apostle saith that that man is unworthy of the Lord, which celebrates this mysterie otherwise than it was celebrated by him. For that man cannot be devout, which presumes to doe otherwise than it was given us by the author.*

# THE ANATOMY OF *THE MASSE.*

## FIRST BOOKE.

### CHAP. I.

THE Inſtitution of the holy Supper by Chriſt Jeſus, as it is contained in the firſt Epiſtle of the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* to the *Corinthians* Chap. 11.

23 *I have received of the Lord that which alſo I delivered unto you; that the Lord Jeſus the ſame night in which he was betrayed, tooke bread;*

24 *And when he had given thankes, hee brake it and ſaid, Take, eate: This is my body, which is broken for you: this doe in remembrance of me.*

25 *After the ſame manner alſo he tooke the cup when he had ſupped, ſaying, This cup is the New Teſtament in my blood: This doe ye as oft as you drink it, in remembrance of me.*

26 *For as often as ye eate this bread, and*

*drink this cup, ye doe shew the Lords death till he come.*

27 *Wherefore, whosoever shall eate this bread, and drinke this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the bodie and blood of the Lord.*

28 *Let a man therefore examine himselfe, and so let him eate of that bread, and drink of that cup.*

29 *For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himselfe, not discerning the Lords body.*

Saint *Mathew* in the 26 Chap. and 29 Verse, addes these words of the Lord.

*BVt I say unto you, I will not drinke henceforth of this fruit of the Vine untill that day when I drinke it new with you in my Fathers Kingdome.*

And in the 27 verse he testifieth that Christ presenting the cup to his Disciples, said, *Drink ye all of it.*

CHAP. II.

## CHAP. II.

### *Foure and thirty contrarieties between the Lords holy Supper and the Maſſe; and how farre the Church of Rome is departed from the Inſtitution of the Lord.*

NOne can deny but that our Lord Jeſus did inſtitute the holy Supper aright and as it ought: And it were an impiety to find fault with his inſtitution. Therefore the ſhorteſt way, yea the only meanes to end all our differences, would be to come back to Chriſts inſtitution, and to ſpeake as he ſpake, and to doe as he did. That is the thing which we deſire and beg with ſo much earneſtneſſe, and whereunto the Church of *Rome* can by no meanes agree. For the Councell of *Trent* in the XXII Seſſion denounceth *Anathema* on all thoſe that ſhall ſay that in the Canon of the Maſſe there is any errour. Yet nevertheleſſe it is evident that the Maſſe is nothing elſe but a changing and a diſfiguring of the Lords Inſtitution. Whereof we will give ſome examples.

1. Chriſt inſtituting the holy Supper

among his Disciples, spake in a knowne and intelligible tongue to the assistants. On the contrary, the Priest in the Masse speaketh in a tongue which the people understand not.

2. Christ presenting the Cup to his Disciples, said, *Drinke ye all of it.* And S^t. *Paul* in the 1 to the Cor. Chap. 11. vers. 28. bids the people of *Corinth* to drink of the cup, saying, *Let a man examine himselfe, and so let him eate of that bread, and drink of that cup.* And in the 10. Chap. 17. Verse, *We are all partakers of one bread, and of one cup:* according to the Version of the Romane Church, solely authorised by the Councell of *Trent.*

3. Christ in celebrating the Eucharist, spake not of sacrificing his body, and made no offering unto God his Father. On the contrary, the Priest in the Masse pretends to sacrifice Christs body, and offereth him up to God in sacrifice propitiatory for the quick and for the dead, without a warrant, and without Gods command.

4. Christ in the holy Supper made no elevation of the hoste, as likewise the Apostle worshipped not the Sacrament, but sat still at the Table. On the contrarie, the Priest in the Masse lifts up the

the hoste, and maketh the people to worship it.

5. Christ did not cause any bones nor reliques of Saints to be put under the sacred table, and did not aske of God the remission of sinnes through the merits of those Saints whose reliques were under the table. On the contrary, the Priest in the Masse, kissing the Altar, speakes thus to God, [a] *We pray thee, Lord, through the merits of thy Saints, whose reliques are here, that thou wilt vouchsafe to pardon me all my sinnes.*

[a] *Oramus te, Domine, per merita Sanctorum tuorum, quorum reliquiæ hic sunt, & omnium Sanctorum; ut indulgere digneris omnia peccata mea.*

6. Christ said to his Apostles, *Take, eate.* On the contrary, in the Romane Church, a great number of private Masses are sayd, at the intention of such as pay for them, without communicants and without assistants, in which the Priest saith, *Take, eate:* but there is no body either for to take or for to eate. Yea even in publick Masses, the Priest oftentimes eateth and drinketh alone.

7. Three Evangelists, *viz.* S. *Matth.* in the 26 chapter, S. *Marke* in the 14 Chap. and S. *Luke* in the 22. and S. *Paul* in the eleventh chapter of the first to the *Corinthians*, testifie that Christ gave bread to his Disciples, saying, *He tooke bread, and brake it, and gave it.* Now

the Sacrament is not given but after the consecration. Christ therefore gave bread after the consecration. And Saint *Paul*, 1 to the *Corinth.* Chap. 11. Verse 26.27. and 28. saith three severall times that *we eate bread.* And in the 10 Chap. Verse 16. he saith that *wee breake bread.* And in the 20 Chap. of the *Acts*, Verse 7. it is said that *the Disciples came together to breake bread.* On the contrary, the Church of *Rome* teacheth, that in the Eucharist no bread is eaten, and that the bread is not broken: but that which the Priest breakes in the Masse, is the body of Christ, which nevertheless cannot be broken.

8. Christ giving that bread, said, *This is my body*, declaring that the bread that he gave, was his body. On the contrary, the Romane Church teacheth that the bread is not the body of Christ: But that the bread is no more bread: and that it is transubstantiated into Christs body. Now how the bread is Christs body, himselfe teaches it, when he adds that it is his commemoration. Even as in the next line following he saith that *the Cup is the New Testament*, because it is the signe and commemoration of it: according to the stile of the Scripture, that giveth

giveth to the signes and memorials the name of the thing which they doe signifie and represent.

9. Christ called that which was in the cup *the fruit of the Vine*, saying, *I will drinke no more of this fruit of the Vine.* On the contrary, the Church of *Rome* teacheth that that which is in the cup, is not the fruit of the Vine, but blood. And saith that in the Cup is not onely the very blood of Christ, but also that his Body, and his Soule and his Divinity is there: and that the Body is whole in every drop of the Chalice. Whereupon it followeth (and the Roman Church beleeves it so) that Christ dranke his flesh, and swallowed downe his owne soule and body, and ate himselfe, and had his head in his mouth.

10. The Evangelists doe record that Christ having taken bread, blessed it. But according to the Church of *Romes* doctrine, which abolisheth the substance of the bread in the Eucharist, Christ did not blesse the bread; for, to destroy a thing and reduce it to nought, is not to blesse it.

11. Christ distributing the bread and breaking it, spake in the present tense, saying, [b] *This is my body which is broken for you* [b] *Hoc est corpus meum quod frangitur.*

*you.* Whereby it appeareth that by his body, he meant the Sacrament or commemoration of his body. For Christs naturall body cannot be broken. To shun the force of this argument, the Latin Version of the Romane Church hath corrupted this place, and in stead of these words, *Which is broken for you*, hath turned *Which shall bee delivered for you*, putting *delivering* for *breaking*, and the future for the present. And indeed our Adversaries are mightily pestered to tell us what it is that the Priest breaketh in the Masse. Doth he breake bread? But they say that it is no more bread. Doth he breake Christs body? But it cannot be broken, and they themselves say that it is whole and entire in the least crum of the hoste, as big and as large as it was upon the crosse. Doth he breake the Accidents of bread which most fraudulously they call *species*, *viz.* the taste, the colour, and roundnesse of the hoste? But these things cannot bee broken. Can a man make peeces of taste, or of whitenesse? None but bodies can bee broken.

1. Cor. 11. 14.

*Quod pro vobis tradetur.*

12. The Apostle Saint *Paul* conforming himselfe to the *Lords* institution, saith in the 10 chapter of the 1. to the

*Corinthians*

*Corinthians*, 16 Verſe, that *the bread which we breake, is the communion of the body of Chriſt*. The Church of *Rome* gainesays and contradicteth every word of this ſentence. The Apoſtle ſaith that it is bread. The Church of *Rome* on the contrary ſaith that it is not bread. The Apoſtle ſaith that it is bread which we breake. On the contrary, the Church of *Rome* ſaith, that it is fleſh which we doe not breake. The Apoſtle ſaith that this bread is the communion of the body of Chriſt. On the contrary, the Church of of *Rome* ſaith, that this bread is Chriſts body it ſelfe. Behold then a cleare and a plaine expoſition of theſe words, *This is my body*: given by the Apoſtle, to wit, *The bread which I breake, is the communion of my body*, and not that which the Church of *Rome* giveth, *viz. That which is under theſe* ſpecies, *is tranſubſtantiated into my body*.

13. It is very conſiderable that the ſame Apoſtle, in the ſame chapter and 21 verſe, maketh an oppoſition between the Lords table and the table of devils, ſaying, *Ye cannot be partakers of the Lords table and of the table of Devils*. The reaſon of the oppoſition ſheweth plainely, that as to be partaker of the table of Devils

vils, is not to eate Devils *: So to be partaker of Christs Table, is not to eat Christ, but to be partaker of the meat consecrated by Christ, in remembrance of Christ and of his death.

* But to be partaker of the meat consecrated to Devils.

14. Christ in distributing the bread and the cup, said, *Doe this in remembrance of me.* These words shew manifestly that the Priest maketh not Christ in the Masse and sacrificeth him not. For it is impossible to make Christ in remembrance of Christ. It is impossible to sacrifice Christ in remembrance of Christ. Can a man build a house in remembrance of that house? Did *Aaron* sacrifice a Lamb in remembrance of that Lambe? Besides that the remembrance is but of things absent and past, as Saint *Austin* saith upon the 37 Psalme, *Nemo recordatur nisi quod in præsentia non est positum: No remembrance can be had but of things that are not present.* The councell of *Trent* declareth indeed that Christ by these words, *Doe this*, commanded that he should be sacrificed in the Masse: But besides that Christ cannot be sacrificed in remembrance of Christ, the Apostle Saint *Paul* presently after these words, *Doe this in remembrance of mee*, addeth the explication, saying, *For as*

*often*

*often as ye eate of this bread, and drinke of this cup, ye doe ſhew the Lords death till he come.* Will we therefore know what is to *Doe this*? Saint *Paul* teacheth us that it is to eate this bread and drinke of this cup, for to ſhew and declare the remembrance of Chriſt his death.

15. Our Lord Jeſus brake the bread before he pronounced the words which they call the words of conſecration. *He tooke the bread, and bleſſed it, and brake it, and gave it,* ſaying, *This is my body which is broken for you.* Whereby it followeth by the doctrine of the *Roman* Church, that he brake bread unconſecrated and untranſubſtantiated. On the contrary, in the *Roman* Church the Prieſt breaks the hoſte after the words of conſecration: to the end the people may beleeve that he breaketh and ſacrificeth the very body of Chriſt. Our adverſaries then confeſſe that the Prieſt breaketh an other thing than Chriſt brake.

Some, for to arme themſelves againſt the Apoſtle, which ſaith that *the bread that we breake, is the communion of the body of Chriſt*, tell us that Saint *Paul* ſaith that we breake bread, becauſe that when he did miniſter this holy Sacrament, he did break afore he conſecrated, follow-

ing

ing Christs example, and consequently did breake unconsecrated bread. But those that speake so, contradict the *Roman* Church, which doth not beleeve that the fraction of the unconsecrated bread, is the communion of the body of Christ.

16. The same Apostle, 1. *Cor.* 11. 28 saith, *Let a man examine himselfe, and so let him eate* OF *this bread*: Which is the same kind of speech used by Christ, saying *Bibite ex eo omnes, Drinke yee all* OF *it*. The Apostle commands us to *eate* OF *this bread*: that is to say, to take every one his part and portion of it: and Christ saying *Drinke ye all of it*, bids the Communicants to take their share of the cup. This manner of speaking is become absurd in the *Roman* Church, who by this bread, understand Christ himselfe. For they would esteeme that man to be mad, or a mocker, that should say that we eate every one his portion of Christs body.

Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες.

17. Christ presenting the cup to his Disciples, said in the present tense that it was his blood which is shed for many. Where manifestly he speaketh of a Sacramentall, and not of a reall effusion. For our adversaries confesse that in the

Masse

Masse the blood of Christ is not shed out of the body, and goeth not out of the Veines. He therefore speaketh of a Sacramentall effusion, which is respective to the real effusion made upon the crosse. We aske then, whether the Priest in the Masse drinketh that blood of Christ which came out of his side and wounds upon the crosse. If they answer that the Priest drinks not that blood of the Lord which issued forth of his body upon the crosse, but that blood which remained in the body, and is there still: thereby they confesse that the Priest drinks not the same blood which Christ will have us to drink. For he commands us expressly to drinke the blood shed for us. But if they answer, that the Priest drinketh the same blood which the Lord shed upon the crosse, then they presuppose rashly, and without word of God, that that blood which came out of the Lords body, is gotten in againe. All this abuse comes for lack of considering that in the holy Supper, Christs body is represented unto us, and presented to our faith, as suffering, and broken, and dying, and dead for us, and his blood as shed and issued out of his body. Whereas on the contrary, the *Romane* Church

Church hath a conceit, that she receiue the spirituall & glorious body of Chri and his blood enclosed within the bo and within the veines.

18. The Apostle Saint *Paul*, 1. *Cor.* 11. And Saint *Luke* chap. 22. record th Christ said, *This cup is the New Testamen in my blood.* If by this word of cup th blood must be understood, the sence o these words shall be, *This blood is th New Testament in my blood.* By tha meanes, loe here two kinds of blood o Christ, whereof the one shall be within the other.

19. Christ in celebrating the holy Supper, said, *Doe this in remembrance of me.* And Saint *Paul* hath told us here above, that in eating this bread we doe shew his death. On the contrary, the Priest in the Masse saith, that he celebrateth, *In the first place*, the remembrance of the Virgin *Mary*; saying, *Communicantes & memoriam venerantes in primis gloriosæ semperque Virginis Mariæ*; *Communicating and solemnizing in the first place the remembrance of the glorious Virgin Mary*, leaving Christ behind. As *Gabriel Biell* saith in the 32 Lesson of the Canon of the Masse, *First and principally the remembrance is made of*

the

*the most blessed Virgin Mary, because* (saith he) *she is the most safe sanctuary of our calamities, and hath beene the administratrix and dispensatrix of this sacrifice, and all the reason of our hope.*

20. In the whole Institution of the Eucharist, there is no mention made of the Saints, neither is there any command to pray unto Saints: No word of the intercession of Angels. On the contrary, the Priest in the *Confiteor* of the Masse, prayes *Michael* the Archangel, and *John* the Baptist, and all the Saints, to pray for him. There are some Masses in which the Letany is rehearsed, which is but a long chaine of prayers unto Saints. In the Masse, they blesse the Encense through the intercession of *Michael* the Archangell. The Priest askes of God, that he would be pleased to command his Angell to take the consecrated hoste, and to carry it up to heaven. And for an excesse of abuses, at the offertory of the Masse, the Priest saith he makes that oblation in honour of the Virgin *Mary* and of the Saints: As if the holy Supper were instituted in honour of the creatures. That, truely, is to put the creatures above Christ. As when a man gives almes in Gods honour, he

he presupposeth that God is more excellent than the Alme.

21. S. *John* in the 13 chapter, and 27 verse, witnesseth, that in the action of the holy Supper, the Divel entred into *Judas*. But our adversaries, with most of the Fathers, hold, that *Judas* was partaker of the Eucharist, with the rest of the Disciples. They will therefore that both Christ and the Divel have entred together into *Judas*. So they give unto Christ a very unsutable companion; and truely, the Sonne of God, and the Divel, had been very ill lodged together.

22. We agree in this point with our adversaries, that Christ ate and dranke with his Disciples, and was partaker of the holy Sacrament. He sheweth it himselfe sufficiently, when after he had delivered the cup, he said, *I will drinke no more of this fruit of the Vine*. Whereby it followeth, that after the doctrine of the *Romane* Church, Christ did eate himself, and swallowed his owne body and soule, and had his whole body in his mouth, and in his stomacke. By this meanes Christs passible body, devoured the impassible body. Whereupon it were good to know, what Christs body did within the body of Christ, and how Christs

soule

soule could enter into Christs body, seeing that it was in already. And since that that which containeth, and that which is contained, are severall things, and that nothing containeth it selfe: by this doctrine it is evident that they make Christ to have two bodies, the one of which was contained within the other. And since that to eat ones selfe, is a more admirable thing than the Creation of the World, it is not credible that Christ did eat himself, without some great profit should come thereby for our salvation. Yet our adversaries produce none at al.

For to prop so extravagant a doctrin, and which exposeth the Christian Religion to laughter, our adversaries alledge a place out of S. *Austin* upon the 33 Psal. where he saith, that in this Sacrament, Christ did cary himself in his own hands But *Austin* saith not only that he did cary himself in his own hands: But he saith, *Ipse se portabat quodam modo cum diceret, Hoc est corpus meum: he did carry himself in a manner when he said, This is my body.* So a man that carries his owne picture in his hands, carries himself in a maner. Even as it would be a senceleſſe speech to say that the Moon is the Moon in a manner: so is that which Christ carried in his hands,

was his true body, it would be a foolish thing to say that it was his body in some kinde. For concerning the sense of these words, *This is my body*, S. *Austin* expounds them plainely enough in the 11 chapter against *Adimantus*, saying, *The Lord made no difficulty to say, This is my body, when he gave the signe of his body.*

23 Christ our Lord was sitting at the table, his face turn'd towards the Assistants. Whereas the Priest, in the Masse, standeth before an Altar, turning his tayle to the people.

24 Christ gave to every one of the assistants, a piece of the bread he had broken with his hands, which bread his Disciples received with their owne hands. As also in the ancient Church both men and women received with their hands the Sacrament under both kinds: The contrary of all that is practised in the Masse, in which the Priest chops into the mouthes of the Communicants a round wafer unbroken. If a woman hath touched with her hand, I doe not say the hoste, but onely the clothes, or the patine, or the chalice, that would be thought a hainous offence, and a profanation of sacred things.

25 Our Lord Jesus instituted this Sacrament

Sacrament for the remission of sinnes, and for to shew his death. But in the *Roman* Church they sing Masses for the easing of sicke people, for preserving of the vines from a white frost, for the healing of a horse, &c. In all these the priest makes a gaine. For that man at whose intention the Masse is said, is to pay for it. Mat. 26. 28 1. Cor. 11. 16.

26 The Apostle S. *Paul* 1. *Cor.* 11, 12. calleth this Sacrament, the Lords Supper. Whereof we finde but of one sort. But the *Romane* Church hath invented a thousand sorts of Masses. There is the Masse of the *Holy Ghost*. The Masse of S. *Giles*. That of *Linus* Pope. That of S. *Francis*, &c. There are amongst other Masses, that of S. *Catherine*, and that of S. *Margaret*, which are Saints that never were in the World, no more than S. *Ursula*, S. *Longis*, S. *Christopher*, and many others, which they have placed in heaven, though they were never upon earth. Item there are *Loud* Masses and *Lowe* Masses. *Great* Masses and *Small* Masses. *Dry* Masses. *Episcopall* Masses. Masses in *White*, and others in *Greene*, and others in *Violet* colour.

27 Christ in the holy Supper made no prayer for the dead. On the contrary

*Qui dormiunt in somno pacis.*

there is in the Masse a prayer for the dead, by which the Priest prayeth for the deceased which sleepe in the sleepe of peace. A thing which is to be carefully observed. For it showeth that when this prayer was added to the Masse, they did not then beleeve the Purgatory. For those that burne for many ages in a hott burning Fornace, sleepe not peaceably.

28. *Item*, the confession which the Priest maketh at the Masse, in the *Confiteor*, is very farre from the Lords institution. For in it the Priest confesseth his sinnes unto God, and to the Virgin *Mary*, and to *John* the Baptist, and to *Peter* and *Paul*, and to all the Saints. None is there left out but Christ.

29. In the Masse of the Friday before Easter, they worship the image of the Crosse with the highest adoration, called by them *Latria*, which is due to God alone, saying, *Behold the wood of the Crosse, Come, let us worship.* There likewise is sung the *Antheme* which saith, *We doe worship thy Crosse O Lord.* And speaking to the Crosse, *Faithfull Crosse, the onely noble among the trees, &c.* That is to speake to an senceless thing, and which understandeth not.

30. Vpon

30. Vpon the Altar there be Images, as also in all places of the Churches, that are commanded to be worshipped, under the penalty of a curse, by the second councell of *Nice*, and by the councell of *Constantinople*, which they tearme the Eighth generall Councell, and by many *Popes*, and generally taught by the *Jesuites*.

31. Christ celebrated the holy Supper with all simplicity. But the Priests of the *Roman* Church, sing Masse with allegoricall habits, and full of mysteries, with a thousand turnes and undecent gesticulations, unbeseeming the holinesse of that action. They busie the eyes of the people, because their eares are of no use unto them.

32. In the Canon of the Masse there is an evident untruth. For the Priest saith, that the Lord when he had taken the Chalice into his hands, said, *This is the Chalice of my blood of the new and eternall Testament mysterie of the Faith.* Contrary to the testimony of the Evangelists, in which these words are not to be found. Pope *Innocent* in the chapter *Cum Marthe de celebratione Missarum*, saith, that the Church holdeth that from the Tradition. Which he will have men

to beleeve, though it be contrary unto the Goſpell.

33. All that Chriſt ſaid, in celebrating this Sacrament, he pronounced it with a loude and intelligible Voice; he did not mutter in ſecret the words which are called the words of conſecration, as the now *Roman* Church doth, which in this point as in many others, differs from the Greeke and Eaſterne Churches, which pronounce the words of conſecration with a loud voyce. The Pope *Innocent* the third, in the third booke of the Myſteries of the Maſſe, chapter firſt: And *Durant* in the fourth Booke of his *Rationals*, Chap. 35. renders the reaſon of this change: To wit, that one day it came to paſſe that certaine Shepheards having learned the words of conſecration, pronounced them upon the bread of their ordinary meale, which was inſtantly turned into fleſh; Wherewith God being angry, ſent downe fire from heaven that conſumed them. Nevertheleſſe, they vary in the recitall of this fable, and doe not tell where, and when that came to paſſe, neither doe they bring any witneſſe, nor doe agree one with another in the relation of that ſtory.

34. After

34. After that the Disciples of the Lord had taken the Sacrament, Christ did not command that the remainders of the bread should be lockt up in a box, and kept for to be carried in pompe up and downe the streets, as the *Roman* Church doth on *Corpus Christi*-day, and in its *Octaves*. This holy day was instituted by Pope *Urbanus* the fourth, in the yeare of our Lord 1264. as Pope *Clement* the fifth his successor doth testifie in the third booke of his *Clementines*. Tit. 16. where *Urbans* Epistle by which he did institute this holy day, is inserted, wherein he saith he was moved so to doe *By a Revelation made unto some Catholick persons*. By which Catholick persons hee meaneth a Nunne of *Leodium* called *Eva*, whom he had knowne when he was Arch-Deacon of the same place. This woman said that God had revealed unto her that he did not like well that every Saint had his holy day, and hee none. Nevertheless, this feast had been extinguished, if *Clement* the fifth had not instituted it againe some Forty yeares after.

*Binius Notis in Concilia in vita Urbani IV. Idque ex Molano & Petro Premonstratēs. Vide Severinum de Proces. lib. 2. c. 9. & Epistolam Urbani IV. ad Eun.*

## CHAP. III.

*How the change in the Lords institution, hath changed the nature of the Sacrament. And that in the Masse there is no consecration.*

THis change, and so horrible a depravation of the institution of the Lord, hath wholy abolished the nature of the Sacrament. For Sacraments are sacred signes. Not onely the Ancient, but also all the Doctors of the *Roman* Church doe define the Sacrament after that manner, saying that *Sacramentum est sacrum signum.* So in Baptisme, water is the signe, and Christs blood is the thing signified. And in the holy Supper, the bread and the wine are the signes, but the body and blood of Christ are the things signified. Even therefore, as if the water were taken away from Baptisme, it would be no more a Sacrament nor Baptisme: so the Eucharist in the *Roman* Church is no more a Sacrament, since the signes, to wit the bread and wine are abolished: in stead of which they put Christs naturall body and blood

blood, which they call the Sacrament. Wherfore the Councell of *Trent* ordaineth that the Sacrament be worshipped. By this meanes Christ in the Masse is the figure and the signe of himselfe, as *Bellarmine* with the rest teacheth: as if one should say that a man is the picture of himselfe. Sef. XIII. chap. 5. *Bellar. lib. 2. de Eucharist. cap. 24* Christus sui ipsius figura fuit.

Moreover, the Sacraments are not instituted for to make Christ come downe to us, but to lift up our hearts to him. Nor for to eate Christ with our teeth, but to feed our soules and strengthen our faith.

Againe, by Transubstantiation the consecration of the Sacrament is destroyed: and there is nothing in the Masse that is consecrated. The bread is not consecrated: for they hold that the bread is no more bread. Christs body is not consecrated; for Christ cannot be consecrated by men. Neither can the accidents of bread and wine be consecrated. For lines, colours, and taste, are not the offering which is pretended to be offered unto God. Therefore there being nothing consecrated, there is no consecration: and there being no consecration, there is no Sacrament.

CHAP. IV.

## CHAP. IV.

### *That by altering the Lords Institution, the* Romane *Church hath changed the nature of Christ.*

THis change is gone so farre, that Christs humane nature, by Transubstantiation, is wholy destroyed and abolished. For the Scripture speaking of Christs humane nature, saith, that *he is like unto us in all things, sinne excepted.* But the *Roman* Church giveth unto Christ a body that is nothing like ours. Whence followeth, that he is no more our brother: so that all the glory of the faithfull which consisteth in haveing a brother who is the eternall Sonne of God, is altogether abolished.

Heb. 2. 17. & c. 4. 15.

For the Church of *Rome* forgeth unto Christ a body, which is in many severall places at one and the same time: which is in Heaven and upon severall Altars, but not in the space that is between. From whence followeth, that Christs body is separated from it selfe, and farre from it selfe, and higher and lower

owre than it ſelfe. There is no leſſe abſurdity in willing that an humane body be at the ſame time in ſeverall remote places, than to will that a man, in one and the ſelfe ſame moment, be in two ſeverall yeares, and ſo be young and old at once, and out-live himſelfe.

The ſame doctrine giveth unto Chriſt an humane body, which is whole in every crumme of the Hoſte, and hath his head and his feet in one and the ſelfe ſame place, and both his eies under one point. Can a man ſay that a body whoſe parts are not one out of the other, and differ not in ſituation, and which taketh and filleth no place, and is more ſpirituall than the very ſpirits themſelves, is a true humane body? And for that cauſe the prieſts of the *Romane* Church ſhave or keep ſhort the beard of their upper lips. For that Church beleeveth that if a Prieſt ſhould dip his muſtachoe in the chalice, the whole body of Chriſt would remaine hang'd at every haire thereof.

The ſame doctrine forgeth unto Chriſt two bodies of a contrary nature, and unto which are attributed contradictory things. For the body of Chriſt which was at the table celebrating the Euchariſt, did ſpeake and ſtirre his hands: But

he

he that was in the mouthes and ſtom
of the Apoſtles, neither ſpake not ſtir
his hands. The ſoule of Chriſt as he
at the table, was in anguiſh: but t
which was in the Apoſtles mouth, ſu
red no griefe. Chriſt after he was ri
from the table & entred into the gard
did ſweat great drops of blood: bu
that was in the Apoſtles ſtomacks, didn
ſweat drops of blood. Which of th
two is our Saviours? Or if it be the ſa
Chriſt, how is he contrary to himſelfe?

Furthermore, by this doctrine, t
whole hiſtory of Chriſts life is made
diculous, and turn'd into a fable. F
if Chriſts body may be in ſeverall remo
places at once, it may be ſaid that whil
he was in the Virgins wombe, peradve
ture he was in other wombes: And th
whilſt he was upon the Croſſe, he wa
ked in *Spaine*. From thence alſo follow
eth, that all the journies that Chri
made to and fro, going and commin
from *Galilea* to *Judea*, were to no pur
poſe. For why did he goe from *Galile*
to *Judea*, if he might be in both place
at one & the ſame time, and be found i
*Judea*, without budging from *Galilea*?

What? (ſay they) is not God om
nipotent for to doe this? I anſwer
that

that God without queſtion could doe all theſe things if he would. But I ſay, it is impoſſible that God ſhould will ſuch things. For he is no lyar, and cannot contradict himſelfe. But it were to contradict himſelfe, if he would that at one and the ſame time a man ſhould ſpeake and not ſpeake, ſtirre and not ſtirre, ſuffer and not ſuffer, and be farre and remote, and divided from himſelfe. He will have Chriſts body to be a true humane body. God will not have a thing ſo abſurd and contradictory, wherby they will that in the Hoſte there be accidents without a ſubject, and (as Pope *Innocent* the third teacheth) that there be in the hoſte greatneſſe and nothing great, color and nothing colored. As if one ſhould ſuppoſe an eccliplſe of the Sunne without a Sunne, a halting of a legge and no legge, a ſickneſſe without a ſick-man. Beſides, the omnipotencie of God is not the rule of our faith, but his Will. By that meanes, a man might maintaine all the fables of the *Alcoran*, ſaying that God is powerfull ſo to doe. Joyne to this, that God doth nothing but wiſely. Therefore he will never have Chriſt to be ſubject to ſinnefull men, now that he

*Innoc.* III. *lib. 4. de myſter. Miſſa. cap.* 11. Eſt enim hic color & ſapor, quantitas & qualitas, cùm nihil alterutro ſit coloratum aut ſapidum, quantum aut quale.

he is glorified, and be exposed to
disgraces and ignominie which
make him suffer every day, whereof
be spoken hereafter.

## CHAP. V.

*Of* Maldonats *audaciousnesse*
*giving Saint* Paul *and Sa*
Luke *the lye: and in correcti*
*Saint* Matthew *& Saint* Mar
*And touching the fruit of*
*Vine.*

OF all the words which the Lo
used in the Institution of the E
charist, none gaule and vex our A
versaries more, than those which he pr
nounced in delivering the cup, saying
*This Cup is the New Testament:* and tho
by which he calleth that which was
the cup, *the fruit of the Vine.* For the
are forc'd (as we shall see hereafter)
to acknowledge in these words, *Th*
*Cup is the New Testament*, a figure lik
unto that which is in these words, *Thi*
*is my Body*: and confesse that it is the
signe and remembrance of it. Besides
tha

that to presuppose that Christ called his blood the *fruit of the Vine*, is out of all likelyhood.

Against these words of the Lord, *This Cup is the New Testament*, related by Saint *Luke* and Saint *Paul*, *Maldonat* the Jesuite is madde and furious, and stirred up with an audaciousnesse full of impiety, and speaketh of these two organs of Gods Spirit, as of two lyars that have not related the Lords words according to the truth: And will have men to give credit to the testimony of Saint *Matthew*, which saith *This is my blood*: and not to the words of Saint *Luke* and Saint *Paul* which witnesse that the Lord said, *This cup is the New Testament*. Here be his words upon the 28 Verse of the 26 chapter of Saint *Matthew*: *There needs not many words. I denie that Christ said these words: For seeing that* Matthew *which was present, and* Marke *that had learned it of* Matthew, *writ that Christ gave his blood in these words, This is my blood of the New Testament, it is reasonable to beleeve that Christ did rather use the words of* Matthew *and* Mark, *than those of* Luke *and* Paul. And a little after, maintaining that Christs intent was to give his owne blood, hee speaketh of

* *Nec multis opus est verbis. Nego Christum hæc verba dixisse. Cum enim Matthæus qui aderat, & Marcus qui ex Matthæo didicerat, scribant Christum his verbis sanguinem suum tradidisse, Hic est sanguis meus novi Testamenti, æquum est credere Matthæi potius & Marci, quã Lucæ & Pauli verbis usum esse, &c.*

of Saint *Luke* and of Saint *Paul* as no
having well conceived Christs meaning
saying, Luke *and* Paul *seeme to speake*
*such sort, as if Christ had chiefly aimed*
*this*, viz. *to declare that he gave the Ne*
*Testament rather than his blood*. And
little after; *Though we should faine an*
*suppose that Christ spake as it is written*
Luke *and* Paul, *&c.*

Truly this presumption is intoler-
ble, to dare contradict thus an Evan-
gelist and an Apostle, *Luke* and *Pa*
saying, *I deny that Christ spake these word*
And to make himselfe a Judge of the f
delity of the Apostles, saying, this ma
is more credible than that man, an
deeme that for to excuse Saint *Luke* an
Saint *Paul*, one must *faine* and presup
pose that which is not.

Every man that hath any remnant o
modesty and feare of God, shall rathe
beleeve that all the Evangelists and A
postles are to be beleeved alike, an
that all have spoken the truth. For i
we beleeve that they have reported som
thing falsly, all the rest of the Scrip
ture becommeth suspect and uncertaine
And though we should grant that Saint
*Luke* and Saint *Paul* have brought som
alteration in the words of the Lord,

yet

yet were we bound to beleeve that they were moved by the holy Spirit to speake after that manner, for to cleare and illustrate Christs words, and turne the myndes of men from grosse thoughts, and take away from the spirit of error the occasion of forging a Transubstantiation.

This Jesuite having thus abused Saint *Paul* and Saint *Luke*, a little after, upon these words *I will drinke no more of this fruit of the Vine*, cleaveth to Saint *Luke* his side against Saint *Marke* and Saint *Matthew*, and * will have Christ to have said these words, *I will drinke no more of this fruit of the Vine*, of the cup of the Passeover, against the testimony of *Matthew* and *Marke*, who report that Christ said these words upon the cup of the holy Supper. Wherein indeed he maketh Christ a lyar. For after the Pascall cup, he dranke the cup of the Eucharist, wherein there was wine. The Lord had spoken against the truth, if in drinking in the cup of the Pascall Lambe, he had said he would drinke wine no more, seeing he dranke of it a little after. Add to this that Saint *Matthew* and Saint *Marke* make not any mention of the Pascall cup; and consequently

* *Maldonat. in 26. Matth. vers 29. Hæc verba quæ Matthæus & Marcus referunt, Christum de calice dixisse, non de eo calice dixit, quo sanguinem suum dedit, sed de eo qui in cœna agni Paschalis à patre familias inter accumbentes distribuis solebat.*

† *Dico vobis, non bibam à modo &c. Qua in parte invenimus calicem mixtum fuisse quem Dominus obtulit Apostolis, & vinũ fuisse quod sanguine suum dixit.*

* *Apud Iuenum part 2. fol. 65. Vinũ fuit in redemptionis nostræ mysterio, cum dixit, Non bibam de genimine, &c.*

* *Quod autem vinum in calice consecravit, patet ex eo quod ipse subjunxit, non bibã à modo &c.*

sequently call not the fruit of the Vine that which was in a cup whereof they spake not.

In this, *Maldonat* hath the Antiquity, Popes, Councels, and the Jesuits themselves against him, which maintaine that these words *I will drinke no more of this fruit of the Vine*, ought to be understood of the cup of the holy Supper. Saint *Cyprian* in the 63 Epistle, *The Lord said,* † *I say unto you, I will drinke no more henceforth of this creature of the Vine,* understood *till that day when I drinke it new with you in my Fathers Kingdome. Wherein we* find that it was a mingled cup which the *Lord offered, and that which he called his blood was wine.*

The Councel of *Wormes* in the fourth chapter. * *It was wine in the mystery of our redemption, when the Lord said, I will drinke no more of the fruit of the Vine.*

Pope *Innocent* the third, in the fourth booke of the Mysteries of the Masse, Chapter 27. * *Now that it was wine which Christ consecrated in the Chalice, it appeareth by that which hee addeth, I will drinke no more of the fruit of this Vine.*

The Catechisme of the Councell of *Trent,*

*Trent*, in the Chapter of the Sacrament of the Eucharist: † *The Catholick Church hath alwayes taught, that our Saviour used Wine in the institution of this Sacrament, seeing that himselfe said, I will drinke no more of this fruit of the Vine.*

† *Salvatorē vino in hujus Sacramenti institutione usū esse Catholica Ecclesia semper docuit.*

*Salmeron* the Jesuite, in the IX Tome in the fourteenth Treatise, holdeth the same; and the Jesuite *Vasquez* upon the third part of *Thomas*, Tome III. in the Dispute 196 chap. 4. * *I thinke Christ said these words, I will drinke no more of this fruit of the Vine, of the chalice of his blood*, and proveth his saying by the Fathers.

* *Ego existimo verba illa, Non bibam, &c. Christum dixisse de calice sanguinis sui.*

---

## CHAP. VI.

*How much Christ is dishonoured by this Doctrine. And of the character indelible: And of the power of creating ones Creator.*

THe very cauteles of the Masse doe sufficiently discover the abuse, and maketh every man that loveth Christ shake with horror; At the end of the old editions of the *Roman* Decree, are

added many penitentiall Canons, where-
of the nine and thirtieth is such: * *When*
*a mouse eateth or gnaweth the body of*
*Christ, for the penance in this case, look*
*for the second distinction of the Consecra-*
*on, towards the end.*

In the new Masse-Booke reviewed and amended by the Popes authority, there is in the beginning a treatise of the defects that happen in the Masse, where these rules are found in the third chapter: † *If the consecrated hoste vanish a-*
*way by some accident, as if it be carried*
*away with the winde or by some miracle:*
*or eaten up by some beast, and cannot be*
*found, then let another be consecrated, be-*
*ginning again about the place of the Masse,*
*Qui pridie, &c.* And in the tenth chapter: * *If a Flye or Spider fall into the*
*chalice, and that the Priests Stomack rise*
*not against, and feare not any danger there-*
*by, let him swallow the Flye or Spider with*
*the blood.* And in the same Chapter: † *If in winter the blood doe freeze in the*
*chalice, let the chalice be wrapped up in hot*
*clothes.* Note these words, *If the blood*
*doe freeze.* Whilest Christ is full of glo-

* Quando mus corrodit aut comedit corpus Christi.

† *De defectibus circa Missam occurrentibus, cap. 3. §. 7. Si hostia consecrata disparet vel casu aliquo, ut vento, aut miraculo, vel ab aliquo animali accepta, & nequeat reperiri, tunc altera consecretur ab eo loco incipiendo, Qui pridie, &c.*

* Cap. 10. *Si musca vel aranea ceciderit in calicem, & non fuerit Sacerdoti nausea, nec ullum periculum timeat, sumat cum sanguine:* † Cap. 10. §. 11. *Si in hieme congelatur sanguis in calice, involvatur calix pannis calefactis.*

ry in heaven, they thaw him here upon earth. Let them tell us what body or what substance is frozen in the chalice: For all Ice is a body.

But above all is to be noted, that which is found in the same Chapter: * *If the Priest vomit up the Eucharist, and that the species appeare whole, they must be chewd againe with reverence: unlesse the stomack should loath them. For then the consecrated species must bee carefully sifted, and put into a sacred place, and after that be cast into the reliquary or shrine wherein reliques are kept.*

* Cap. 10. § 14. *Si Sacerdos evomat Eucharistiam, species integræ appareant, revertenter sumantur, nisi nausea fiat. Tunc enim species consecratæ cautè separentur, & in loco sacro reponantur.*

Pope *Innocent* the third in the fourth Booke of the Mysteries of the Masse, Chapter 16, moveth a very important question. He asketh that if a flux or looseneſſe takes a Priest that hath nothing in his stomack but consecrated hoſtes, what is the matter that comes out of his body? Of which difficulty the Pope rids himselfe wisely, saying with the Apostle: *Be not wiser than it behooveth, but bee wise unto sobriety.*

By these things it appeareth that God, stirred up with anger against men that have rejected his word, hath strucken them with giddines. For who would

ever have thought that Christian men would have come to that point as to worship a God which may bee stolne, or carried away with the winde, so that one may say *God is lost.* A God that may be gnawed by mice, and devoured by brute beasts. A God that is wrapped in the middest of vomiting and spuing, and that must be eaten and chewed againe. A God who being fallen downe cannot rise up againe: Of whom their Doctors * say, that under the hoste he cannot open his eyes, nor stirre his hands: and that he is neither lieing, sitting, nor standing.

* *Vasquez in 3 partem Thomæ Tomo 3. Disp. 191. cap. 3. Neque agere, neque pati potest corpus Christi prout est in hoc Sacramento, corporea actione neque passione.*

Our Adversaries doe answer that when Mice have gnawed or carryed away the consecrated hoste, or that a beaste hath devoured it, Christ suffereth no paine nor hurt thereby, But they cannot deny but that Christ thereby is exposed to laughter, and suffers a greater ignominie than that of the Crosse. To be eaten by beasts and vomited up, and wrapped among vomiting and spuing, is a thing more shamefull than to be crucified. The *Turks* and *Pagans* will say, Is that the God of the Christians that could not defend himselfe against Mice, and which is devoured by Dogs?

Dogs? Certain it is, that God would never make the glorious body of his Son to be ſubject to ſo many ignominies, without it were very beneficiall and uſefull unto the Church. And yet our Adverſaries cannot tell us what good it doth to our Salvation that Chriſt ſhould be thus carried away by a mouſe, or devoured by brute beaſts.

Cardinal *Tolet* the Jeſuit, in the ſecond Booke of the Inſtitution of Prieſts, chapter 25. ſaith, † *The Prieſts can conſecrate many baskets of bread, and a Tunne of wine.* If he can conſecrate one Tun, he may alſo conſecrate two, yea tenne or twentie, and ſo may turne into blood all the Wine of a Market.

† *Poteſt conſecrare Sacerdos multos cophinos panis & vini dolium.*

Whereupon tis neceſſary to know that the Church of *Rome* holdeth, that by conferring of the order of Prieſthood, an Indelible character is engraven into the Soule of the Prieſt, So that the Pope himſelfe cannot blot it out: And that a Prieſt degraded for Hereſie, or other crime, may conſecrate and tranſubſtantiate bread into fleſh, and wine into blood, by vertue of that character remaining in him, though the function of his office be interdicted unto him. By that meanes, a Prieſt that

hath forsaken the *Roman* Religion, yea a Priest * Sorcerer and a Magician, may transubstantiate whole tuns of wine into blood, and make Christs blood to be carried up and downe in pints and bottles over al the taverns & tipling houses of a town: which is truly to make Christ the sport of Magicians and drunkards, and expose him to great ignominy.

By the same doctrine Christ is in the power of Priests, who make him, and pin him up, and walke him, and may if they will, cast him into the fire: As *Gabriel Biel* a famous Doctor saith, in the first Lesson upon the Canon of the Masse: † *The Priest hath great power over the one and the other body of Christ*, that is to say, over the Church, and over the consecrated hoste. Whereupon he addeth: * *Whoever saw things like unto this? He that hath created me (if I may say so) hath given me to create him; And he that hath created mee without me, is created by my meanes.* Thus Priests doe create Christ in the Masse, and make Christ who is made already: As if one should beget a man already born.

* Vasquez Tomo III. in 3. parte Thomæ Disp. 171. Cap. 3. *Cum constet Sacerdotibus à Christo fuisse potestatem consecrandi, ita ut licet consecrare velit in malum usum, nempe pro veneficijs & incantationibus, consecratio eorum effectum haberet.*

† Biel Lect. 1. in Canonem Missæ. *Super utrumque corpus Christi Sacerdos insignes habet potestates.*

* *Quis hujus rei vidit similia? Qui creavit me (si fas est dicere) dedit mihi creare se. Et qui creavit me, creatur mediante me.*

CHAP. VII.

## CHAP. VII.

*That the very words of the Masse are contrary to Transubstantiation.*

IN the midst of this alteration of the Lords Institution, God hath permitted that in the Masse some clauses should remaine, which manifestly condemne the Transubstantiation. For a great part of the Canon of the Masse are prayers, which have beene added when they did not yet beleeve the Transubstantiation. As when the Priest, having before him the consecrated hoste, saith, * *Wee offer to thine excellent Majesty of thy gifts and presents a pure hoste.* By these gifts, they understand at this day Christ himselfe. Surely, never a man in his right sense called Christ gifts and presents in the plurall: But that agrees very well with the bread and wine.

The Priest goes on, saying, † *Upon which things vouchsafe to looke with a cheerefull eye.* Is it not a jeast to call Christ

* *Offerimus præclaræ tuæ Majestati de tuis donis & datis hostiam puram.*

† *Supra quæ propitio ac sereno vultu respicere dignéris, & accepta habere, sicut accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui justi* Abel.

Christ these things ? and for a full measure of abuse, to aske of God that he may looke upon Christ with a gracious eye : as if Christ had need of our recommendation ?

Moreover, the Priest demandeth of God afterward, that he would be pleased to have these gifts and presents as acceptable, as he had acceptable the presents of *Abel*. That is to say, that Christ may be as acceptable unto God, as the beasts sacrificed by *Abel*. This prayer is good being said upon the bread and the wine, but being said upon Christ, it is altogether blasphemous.

Chiefly, this is evident, in that the Priest looking upon the consecrated hoste and the chalice, saith, that * *by Christ our Lord, God creates alwayes for us these good things, sanctifies them, and vivifies them.* Can Christ be called *these good things* ? Doth God create and vivifie Christ alwayes ? And since God creates these things through Jesus Christ, as the Masse saith, it is certaine these things are not Christ. But all that agrees very well with the bread and wine.

* *Per Christum Dominum nostrum, per quem haec omnia, Domine, semper bona creas, sanctificas, vivificas, benedicis.*

We must not omit that Christ giveing the bread to his Disciples, said simply, *Take,*

*Take, Eate,*; But in the Canon of the Masse there is, *Accipite & manducate ex hoc omnes: Take and eate all of it.* Whosoever added these words EX HOC, he did not beleeve that in the Eucharist the Lords body was really eaten by the mouth of the body. For *to eate of that*, is to eate a part thereof, and not all. Which cannot be said of Christs naturall body.

## CHAP. VIII.

### *Recrimination of our Adversaries.*

THe Prophet *Elisha* accused the Israelites of Idolatry, and of forsaking Gods Covenant. They out of revenge called him bald-pate, which was a reproach nothing belonging to the doctrine. We stand upon the like termes with our Adversaries. We accuse the *Roman* Church to have brough in Idolatry in the Masse, worshipping of the Sacrament, and a Sacrifice of Christs body, which Christ hath not instituted: To have taken away from the people the

the halfe of the Sacrament: To have changed the nature of the Sacrament, yea of Christ himselfe: which are things of importance, and altogether essentiall to the Eucharist and to Christian Religion. But they, out of recrimination, tell us, that we have likewise changed many things in the Lords Institution. For (say they) ye solemnize the Supper in the morning: but Christ instituted it after Supper. Ye celebrate it in a Temple: but Christ did celebrate it in an upper Chamber. Ye receive women to the Communion: But when Christ instituted the Eucharist, there were none but men. Things, whereof the two first are indifferent, and all three not onely are not of the essence of that Sacrament, but even make no part of that action.

To this objection, Christ affords us an answer. For hee said, *Doe this in remembrance of mee.* Hee said not *Doe this in such a place, nor at such an houre, nor with such a Sexe or such persons:* But hee said, *Doe this*, commanding us to doe as hee hath done, and to imitate his action. Christ did not exclude women. If any had beene there present, worthy to be partakers

of

of the holy Supper, he would not have rejected them.

## CHAP. IX.

*Cauſes why the Pope admitteth not of any alteration in the Maſſe, and will not conforme himſelfe to the Lords Inſtitution.*

THough the abuſe be ſo apparent, yet the Church of *Rome* and the Pope will not let goe their hold, and ſuffer any change or alteration to be made in the Maſſe. The cauſe of that is eaſie to be knowne. For if the Church of *Rome* ſhould yeeld to the leaſt alteration, it would overthrow the three Maximes that are the baſis whereon all Popery is grounded, whereof the firſt is, that *the Church of Rome cannot erre*: the ſecond, that *the Pope and Church of Rome are not ſubject to the holy Scripture, and have greater authority than the holy Scripture*: the third, that *the Pope and Church of Rome have power to change Gods Commandements, and make new Articles of Faith.*

All

All which things are ſeene not onely by practice, in that all the doctrine of the *Roman* Church is contrary to the holy Scripture, but alſo by example of Popiſh Councels, and open profeſſion of the principall Doctors of the Church: whereof I will alleadge ſome places in the next chapter.

* *Can. Lect. Diſt. 34. in Gloſſ.* Papa diſpenſat contra Apoſtolum. *Innoc. III. Decretal. de Conceſſione Prælend. Tit. 8. c. p. Propoſuit.* Secundum plenitudinẽ poteſtatis de jure poſſumus ſupra jus diſpenſare. *Et ibi Gloſſa,* Nam contra Apoſtolum diſpenſat. Itẽ contra vetus Teſtamentum. *Et Gloſſa Canonis ſit quidam, Cauſ. 25. quæſt. 1.* Papa diſpenſat in Evangelio interpretãdo ipſum.

## CHAP. X.

*Places wherein the Doctors and Councels of the Roman Church maintain, that the Pope and the Church of Rome are not ſubject to the Scripture, and have greater authority than the Scripture, and may make voide and aboliſh the Commandements of God.*

THe Romiſh Decree and its Gloſſe are all ſtuffed with this brave maxime, * that the Pope may diſpenſe againſt the Apoſtle, and againſt the Old Teſtament, and may diſpenſe with the Law, as being above the Law: And that

he may dispense against the Gospel in giving interpretation to it.

In the first booke of the Decretals of *Gregory* the 9. *Title* 7. at the Chapter *Quanto personam*, the Pope *Innocent* the third saith, that *the Pope, on earth, holdeth not the place of a meere man, but of a very God.* And thereupon the Glosse of the Doctors saith: *The Pope of nothing can make some thing*: And *a sentence that is of no value, he can make it to bee some thing: Because in the thing that he willeth, his will standes him in stead of reason: And no man saith to him, Wherefore doest thou doe that? For he may dispense above the Law, and make of injustice Justice.*

*Thomas Aquinas*, whom the Pope hath Sainted, saith: † *A new edition of a Creed, belongeth solely to the Popes authority.* The same is defined by the Councell of *Florence* in the last Session, to wit, that the Pope may adde to the Creed. That is one of the crimes for which *Luther* was anathematised by Pope *Leo* the tenth, *viz.* because he had taught, *That it is not in the power of the Pope and of the Roman Church, to establish any Articles of faith*: as is to be seen in the Bull added to the last Councell of *Lateran*.

† *Thom. 2. 2. quæst. 1. art. 10. Ad solam authoritatem summi Pontificis pertinet nova editio Symboli.*

* *Bulla exurge Leonis X. subjecta Concilio Lateranensi, inter errores Lutheri hic refertur.* Certum est in manu Ecclesiæ aut Papæ prorsus nō esse statuere articulos fidei.

The

The Cardinall *du Perron* in his book against the King of Great Brittaine hath a chapter * whose title is such *Of the Churches authority, in changing things contained in the Scriptures.*

* 2 Booke, Observat. 3 Cap. 3.

*Vasquez* the Jesuit in the third Tome upon the third part of *Thomas*, Disput. 216. speaking of this Commandement of the Lord, *Drinke yee all of it*, saith * *Though even we should grant that this was a Commandement of the Apostles, yet the Church and the soveraigne Bishop might abolish it upon good grounds. For the Apostles power to make Lawes, was not greater than the power of the Church and of the Pope.*

* Vasquez in 3. Tom. Tomo. 3. Disput. 216 num. 60. Licet concederemus hoc fuisse Apostolorum præceptum, nihilominus Ecclesia & summus Pontifex potuerunt illud justis de causis abrogare, &c.

*Salmeron* the Jesuite in the second Prolegom. * *It is no wonder if the Scripture be subject to the Church, which hath the Spirit.* The same man in the ninth Tome and 13 Treatise, disputing of the change and alteration in the forme of the Sacrament, speakes thus: *Wee are no way tyed to imitate Christ in all things, except in good manners.* By that, hee teacheth we are not bound to imitate Christ in the Sacraments, nor in the communion under one kind, nor in that he celebrated the holy Supper in a known tongue, nor in the doctrine of Purgatory, nor

* Non mirum si Scriptura Ecclesiæ dei quæ spiritum habet, subjicitur.

† 5. Ad illud. Nequaquam astringimur in omnibus Christum imitari, nisi in bonis moribus.

in the Sacrifice of the Masse, &c. For these things concerne not manners.

The same, in the first Prolegom. *The Churches authority is more ancient and more worthy, than the authority of the Scriptures.* That, truly, is to say that men are above God. For it is God that speaketh in the holy Scriptures. Can a man say without impiety that the Church of Israel was above the Law, which God had written in two tables? Are Subjects above the Laws? Is not the Pope subject to the Law of God?

The same Jesuite saith, that *the Christian Religion admitteth still of some additions in things essentiall.* Whence followeth that Christian Religion is not yet perfect, since that essentiall Articles may be added thereunto.

*John Almain*, a Sorboniſt, in his Booke of the Eccleſiaſticall and Temporall power, chapter 12. *The Pope may dispense in things that are forbidden by Gods Law*: and alleadges thereupon *Panormitanus* and *Angelus*.

*Andradius* in the second Booke of the Defense of the Tridentine Faith: *The Roman Biſhops in defining many things that were hidden before, are accuſtomed to enlarge the Creed.* And in the same

[a] *Eccleſiæ authoritas antiquior & dignior authoritate Scripturæ.*

[b] *Salm. Tomo* XIII. *part 3. Diſp. 6. §. Eſt ergò. Doctrina fidei admittit additionem in eſſentialibus.*

[c] *Papa poteſt diſpenſare in illis quæ ſunt legè Dei prohibita.*

[d] *Romanos Pontifices multa definiendo quæ ante latita, bant, ſymbolum fidei augere conſueſſe.*

same place: a *It appeareth those have erred which say that the Roman Bisho may some times dispense from obeying th Lawes of the Apostle Saint* Paul *and th foure first Councels.* Item: b *Our Anab ers, excellent men in Piety, have cano led and abrogated many of the Apostl Decrees.*

Cardinall *Bellarmin* in the fourt Booke de Pontif. chapter 5. *If the Po should erre in commanding the vices, an forbidding vertues, the Church were bou to beleeve that vices be good, and vertu bad, unlesse she would sinne against her own conscience.*

The same Cardinall in the 31 chapte against *Barklay*, *In a good sense Chri gave to Peter* (that is to say to th Pope) *the power to doe that that which i sinne be not sinne, and that which is no sinne to be sinne.*

The Romish Decree in the fortieth Distinction, Canon Si Papa, hath thes words: c *If the Pope being careless of his*

a *Liquet minime eos errasse qui dicunt Rom. Pontifices posse nonnunquam in legibus dispensare à Paulo & à quatuor primis Conciliis.*

b *Minime vero majores nostri religione & pietate excellentes Apostolorũ hac & quam plurima alia decreta refigere in animum induxissent,*

*nisi intellexissent, &c.* c *Si Papa suæ & fraternæ salutis negligens deprehenditur, &c. nihilominus innumerabiles populos catervatim secum ducit primo mancipio gehennæ cum ipso plagis multis in æternum vapulaturos. Hujus culpæ istic redarguere præsumit mortalium nullus, quia cunctos ipse judicaturus à nemine est judicandus, nisi sit à fide devius.*

own

owne Salvation and of the Salvation of his brethren, leadeth by troopes with him, first slave of hell fire, innumerable peoples to be tormented with him with many plagues eternally, none dares reprove him of his faults. Because that he that is to be Judge of all men, is to be judged of none: Except he doe swerve from the Faith.

*Stapleton* an English Doctor, in the second Booke of the authority of the Scripture, chapter 11. * *I have said, and say still, that the Church is the rule of the Scripture.* By this reckoning, Sinners shall rule God, and shall be masters of his word.

*Lindan* in the *Index* of the Chapters of the fifth Booke of his *Panoplia*: *The Church by the will of God is not tyed to the Scriptures.* For he, and the rest with him, will have the Church bound to the *Tradition* of the Church, that is to say to the Lawes which she giveth to her selfe. Now by the Church they understand alwayes the *Roman* Church, and by the *Romane* Church the Pope.

*Costerus* the Jesuite in his *Enchiridion*, Chapter 1. calleth the *Tradition* of the *Romane* Church a second kinde of Scripture, and saith, that

* *Dixi & dico non id ipsius fidei regulam in se esse Scripturam, quæ ipsarum Scripturarum regula esse fidem Ecclesiæ.*

[a] the excellencie of thir Scripture goes farr beyond the Scriptures which the Apostles left unto us written in parchements.

[a] *Hujus Scripturæ præstantia multis partibus superat Scripturas quas nobis in membranis Apostoli reliquerunt.*

Gregory de Valentia the Jesuite, in the fourth Booke of his *Analysis*, chapter 2. [b] The Scripture is not the Judge of controversies. And in the third Chapter. [c] The Scripture is no sufficient rule of Faith. And in the fourth Chapter. [d] The Scripture by the secret judgement of God, is a stumbling block, and a temptation to the feet of fooles, to the end that those which wilfully upon it alone, may easily stumble and fall from the way. Wherefore after he hath withdrawne us from the holy Scriptures, in the seventh Booke he sends us back to the Pope, saying, [e] The Roman Bishop is he in whom resideth that authority of judging wholly of all the controversies of Faith. According as Andradius saith in the first booke of the Defense of the Tridentin Faith, Our faith is confirmed and subsisteth by the Popes faith, and all mens Salvation depends on his authority.

[b] *Scripturam sacram non esse judicem omnium controversiarum fidei probatur.*

[c] *Probatur secunda Scripturam non esse sufficientem fidei regulam.*

[d] *Scripturam arcano Dei judicio esse velut lapidem offensionis, & in tentationem pedibus insipientium, ut qui velint ea sola niti, facillime impingant & errent.*

[e] *Pontifex Romanus ipse est in quo authoritas illa residet quæ in Ecclesia est ad judicandum de omnibus omnino controversijs.*

The

The same Jesuite in his first booke of the Sacrifice of the Masse, Chapter forty, finding no proofes in the Scriptures whereon to ground the Sacrifice of the Masse, saith, that [a] *If this worship or Service were not instituted of God: Yet these men could not draw from thence this conclusion, that it is not lawfull. For that (viz. to be instituted by God) is in no wise required for to make a worship or a Sacrifice to be good.* And in his second booke: [b] *Here above and often elsewhere I have shewed, that for the goodnesse of a worship or service, Gods commandement is not required.*

For these causes, in the fourth Tome of his Commentaries, he affirmeth that [c] *there are some things which in the latter times are better ordained than they were at the beginning.* For he supposeth that the Church now is better instructed than it was in the Apostles time.

Of this power which the *Roman* Church taketh upon her selfe, to change, cancell, and make void the commandements of the Lord, we have a remarkable example in the Councell of *Constance*,

[a] *Si maximè hic cultus non esset institutus à Deo, concluditamen abistis non posset illum non esse legitimum, cum id ad bonitatem cultus & sacrificij minime requiratur.*

[b] *At ego suprà & aliàs sepius ostendi præceptum Dei non requiri ad bonitatem cultus.*

[c] *Greg. de Val. Tomo IV. Disp. 6. qu. 8. Punct. 5. §. 10. Et certe quædam posterioribus temporibus rectius instituta esse, quàm initio se haberent.*

kept in the yeare 1416. which is the firſt Councell that tooke away the Cup from the people. That Councell acknowledgeth in the 13 Seſſion, that Chriſt inſtituted the Euchariſt under both kinds, and that in the Primitive Church the people received the Cup. Yet withall it dare ſay, [a] *that in ſome parts of the World ſome dare affirme raſhly, that the Chriſtian people ought to take the Euchariſt under both kinds*: as if it were a temerity to follow Chriſts example. And ordaining that henceforth the people ſhall receive the ſpecies of the bread onely, will have *this cuſtome to be held as a Law, which it is not lawfull to reprove or change.* Finally this Councell concludeth, that *thoſe which obſtinately affirme the contrary, ought to be driven out as Hereticks, and grievouſly puniſhed.*

With the like audacity the Councel of *Trent* in the 5 Seſſion [b] ſpeaking of the concupiſcence forbidden in Gods Law, which Saint *Paul* in the ſeventh Chapter to the *Romanes* calleth ſinne, declareth and defineth that

[a] *Cum in nonnullis mundi partibus quidam temerarie aſſerere præſumant populum Chriſtianum debere Sacramentum Euchariſtiæ ſub utraque panis & vini ſpecie ſuſcipere.*

[b] *Hanc concupiſcentiã quam aliquando Apoſtolus peccatum appellat, ſancta Synodus declarat Eccleſiam Catholicam eam nunquam intellexiſſe peccatum appellari quod vere & propriè in renatis peccatum ſit.*

concu-

concupiſcence is no ſinne in thoſe that are regenerate, that is to ſay baptized: and that Saint *Paul* ſpake neither truly nor properly. Whence will follow that a baptiſed perſon may without ſinne covet his neighbours wife: but in an unbaptiſed perſon it is a ſin.

Now, let every unpartiall Reader judge, with what reaſon our Adverſaries call our Religion a new Religion, ſeeing they doe declare themſelves that they may change the Commandements of God, add to the Creed, and make a new Religion, and that in the Maſſe they are not tyed to the Lords Inſtitution.

---

## CHAP. XI.

*That our Expoſition of theſe wordes* This is my body, *is conformable to the Scripture and to the nature of Sacraments, and approved by the Ancient Fathers, and confirmed by our Adverſaries.*

THe interpretation that wee give of theſe wordes, *This is my body,*

is the same which Christ himselfe giveth in the same place, *viz.* that *it is his commemoration.* And the same which Saint *Paul* giveth in the 10 chapter of the first to the Corinthians. *The bread which we breake, is the communion of the body of Christ.* The Sacrament being a figure, there is nothing more fit than to make use of a figure, drawne from the nature of the action, by which the name of the thing signified, is given to the signe. Even as in the seventeenth of *Genesis* the Sacrament of Circumcision is called *the Covenant of God,* [a] because it was the signe and remembrance of it. So in the twelfth of *Exodus,* the Sacrament of the Pascall Lambe, is called the *Passe-over,* because it was a memoriall of the Passeover of the Angell sparing the houses of the Israelites.

[a] *Ferus in 17. Genes.* Pactum hoc loco sumitur pro signo pacti. *Eman. Sa, primæ editionis in Notis,* Pactum, id est signum pacti.

And Saint *Paul* 1. *Corinth.* 10. speaking of the Rock which gusht out waters in the Wildernesse, saith that *this Rocke was Christ,* because it was the figure of Christ. As *Austin* saith in the Eighteenth Booke of the City of God, Chapter 48. [b] *the Apostle saith, the Rocke was Christ, because that Rocke did signifie Christ.* And in the 57 question upon the

[b] *Dictum est ab Apostolo, petra erat Christus, quia petra illa de qua hoc dictum est, significabat Christum.*

the Leviticus: *The thing which signifieth, is wont to beare the name of the thing signified, as it is written, Seven eares of corne are seven yeares, and seven kine are seven yeares, and many such like things.* Thence comes what is said, that the Rocke was Christ. He did not say the Rocke signifieth Christ, but as if it were that which it was not in substance, but onely by signification. Pope *Innocent* the third, in the fourth Booke of the Mysteries of the Masse, chapter 7. saith, *Petra erat Christus, id est, significabat Christum. The Rocke was Christ, that is to say, did signifie Christ.* And *Aquinas* in the Exposition of this Epistle: [b] *The Rock was Christ, not in substance, but by signification.* *Lombardus* in his Commentary upon this Chapter, [c] *They did drink of the Rock which signified Christ.* Which thing is confirmed by that word *Was*. For *Bellarmin* that doth invert these words, and translateth *Christ was the Rocke*, seemes to imply that Christ was then the Rock, but is not now.

And the same Apostle to the *Romans*, Chapter 6.4. saith, *Wee are buryed in Christs death by Baptisme*, because Baptisme signifieth to us, that our sins are as buried with Christ, and that

[a] *Hinc est quod dictū est Petra erat Christus. Non enim dixit, petra significabat Christum, sed tanquā hoc esset, quod utique per substantiam non hoc erat, sed per significationem.*

[b] *Petra erat Christus, non per substantiā, sed per significationē.*

[c] *Bebant de petra spirituali, scilicet quæ Christum significabat.*

we

we are to be made conformable to his death.

And without extending my ſelfe further upon this: Chriſt giving the Cup ſaid, *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my blood.* Wherein there is two figures, as *Salmeron* the Jeſuite ſaith truely. *a There is* (ſaith he) *a double Metonymie, by which the continent is put for the thing contained, that is to ſay, the Cup for the wine contained therein: the other, that that which is contained in the Chalice, is called the Covenant or Teſtament, for that it is the ſymbole or ſigne of it becauſe of the ſpecies.* And a little after. b *The blood is called the New Teſtament, as the Circumciſion is called the Covenant, becauſe it repreſenteth that Covenant.* And *Thomas Aquinas* in his Commentary upon the eleventh chapter of the firſt to the *Corinthians*: c *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my blood, as if he did ſay, By that which is contained in this cup, is made a commemoration of the New Teſtament, which was confirmed*

a Salm. Tomo IX. Tra. XV. pag. 98. & 99. *Subeſt in his verbis duplex Metonymia: prima qua continens ponitur pro contento, id eſt poculum ſive calix pro vino, eo quod vinum in ipſo continetur. Altera eſt qua contentum in poculo, id eſt ſanguis ſub ſpecie vini, fœdus vel Teſtamentum dicitur Novum, cum ſit ejus ſymbolum propter ſpecies.* b *Idem ibidem pag.* 100. Dicitur ſanguis Novum Teſtamentum ſicut circumciſio dicitur fœdus, quia illud fœdus repreſentat. c *Hic calix eſt N. T. in meo ſanguine, quaſi dicat, Per id quod in hoc calice continetur, commemoratur N. T. &c.*

*firmed by Christs blood.* And *Emanuel Sa* the Jesuit, in the first edition of his notes upon the first to the *Corinthians*, Chapter 11. saith that the word *IS implies as much as containeth or signifieth.*

This manner of speaking is ordinary, to say a mourning suite, because it is a signe of mourning, & a celestial Spheare, for the figure of a heavenly Spheare: And in shewing of Mappes, to say This is *France*, and that is *Spaine*. And to be lodged at the *Eagle*, or at the *Swan*, for the signe of the Eagle or of the Swan. So doth Saint *Austin* say in the fifty seventh question upon *Leviticus*, *The thing which signifieth, is wont to be called by the name of the thing signified.* And *Theodoret* in the first Dialogue, speaking of these words *This is my body*, saith, that *the Lord gave unto the signe the name of his body.* And *Tertullian* in his fourth Booke against *Marcion*, chapter 40. *He made it to be his body*, saying, *This is my body, that is to say the figure of my body.* Saint *Austin* in the 23 Epistle to *Bonifice*, is very expresse: *If Sacraments had not some resemblance of the things whereof they be Sacraments, they would be no Sacraments. But because of this resemblance, they take very often the name of the things themselves*

themſelves. *Even then as the Sacrament of Chriſts body, is in a manner the body of Chriſt: ſo the Sacrament of faith, to wit Baptiſme, is faith.* Note that he ſaith that the Sacrament of Chriſts body is the body of Chriſt, after the ſame manner as Baptiſme is faith.

Therefore our Adverſaries ſay very ignorantly, that figures elſewhere are receiveable; but in the Articles of faith and inſtitution of a Sacrament, figures are no way convenient or agreeable. For we have produced many examples of figures in the inſtitution of Sacraments: and they themſelves acknowledge two figures in theſe words, *This Cup is the New Teſtament.* And touching the Articles of faith, the Creede ſaith that *Chriſt ſitteth at the right hand of God*, which is a figurative kinde of ſpeech; for God hath no right hand. The whole Goſpell is comprized under theſe words, *Jeſus is the Lambe of God*: and all Popery is grounded upon theſe words, *Upon this Rock will I build my Church, and I will give thee the keyes of the kingdome of heaven*, which be all figurative words.

And it is to be obſerved that when Chriſt inſtituted this holy Sacrament, he

he spake in the *Jewish* language, which is a dialect of the *Syrian* tongue, saying * *Hanan pagri*, that is to say, *This my dead body*, supplying the word *IS*, after the manner of the *Hebrewes* and *Syrians*. He did then say to his Disciples, that hee gave them his dead body. Which could not be true but in taking it figuratively: For the body of Christ was not dead when he did institute this Sacrament. But it is very true in the sense that we take it, to wit, that the bread which he did breake, and give to his Disciples, was the figure or remembrance of his body, dead for us. For we have shewed already, that in the holy Supper Christs body is presented to our faith, not as glorious and spirituall, but as broken, and dying, and dead for us. This is confirmed in that in the Evangelists, this word σῶμα, which signifieth body, is in most places taken for a dead body: As in the 17 of Saint *Luke* Verse 37. * *Where soever the body is, thither will the Eagles be gathered together.* And *Matthew.* 27. 52. † *My bodyes of Saints which slept, arose.* And *Mark* 14. 8. μυρίσαι τὸ σῶμα, *to annoint the body.* For the proper word in *Greek* for to signifie a dead body, is πτῶμα.

* גויה pro cadavere. 1. Sam. 17. 46. Amos. 6. 3. Es. 14. 19. 2. Paral. 20. 24. Gen. 15. 11 Num. 19. 29.

* ὅπου τὸ σῶμα &c.

† σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων.

Tis

Tis true that in the Syriack Testament, the word *Peger* is taken sometimes for a living body: But it is not credible that Christ tooke this word in an other sense than it is taken in the Old Testament, where it signifieth alwayes a *dead bodie*.

Neither is it to be omitted that Saint *Paul* cals oftentimes the Church Christs body, *Ephes.* 1. 23. and Chapter. 5. 23. If then from these words, *This is my body*, they will inferre that the bread is transubstantiated into Christs body: by the like reason when the Scripture saith that *the Church is the body of Christ*, it may bee inferred that the Church is transubstantiated into Christs bodie.

CHAP. XII.

## CHAP. XII.

*That our Adverſaries, to avoide a cleare and naturall figure, forge a multitude of harſh and unuſuall ones, and ſpeake but in figurative tearmes. And of* Berengarius *his confeſſion.*

OVr Adverſaries, who make a ſhew to be enemies to Figures, forge nevertheleſſe a great number of abſurd and violent figures, and turne all into figures.

When Chriſt ſaith *This is my body*, by *This*, they underſtand an *individuum Vagum*, or *that which is under theſe ſpecies*; without determining any thing. Others interprete the word *IS*, by ſhall be or ſhall become. For they ſay that the Tranſubſtantiation is not made or effected, till the words be pronounced.

When the Evangeliſts ſay that the Lord gave bread, by this word *bread*, they underſtand *fleſh*. And wee have heard

heard them confesse that these word
*This cup is the New Testament in my blo*
are figurative.

By their doctrine, which puts t
body into the cup, Christ giving t
cup, might have said *This is my bo*
and had spoken truely, if wee belee
them.

Christ called that which he drank
in the Eucharist, the *fruit of the Vi*
But our Adversaries by the fruit
the Vine, will have the blood to be u
derstood.

By these words *Doe this*, they u
derstand *Sacrifice me*; but the words fo
lowing, *Doe this in remembrance of m*
doe refute that interpretation. For it i
impossible to Sacrifice Christ in remem
brance of Christ.

Wee shall see anone that when i
the 6 of Saint *John*, Verse 53. Chri
saith, *Except yee drinke my blood, yee ha*
*no life in you*: our adversaries, least the
should be accused of taking the lif
from the Lay people, in depriving the
of the cup, by the word *drinking*, the
understand *eating*. And that whe
Christ saith, *I leave the World, and am n*
*more in the world*, they add this taile to it
to wit, *by my visible presence*.

We

We have seene before, that the Apostle saith foure severall times, that in the Lords Supper, we breake bread and eate bread. To shun the force of these words, they wrest them into figures, saying that it is not bread that we eate: But that figuratively Christs body is called *bread*, because it seemes to be so. Which thing they know to be false: for Christs body never seemed to be bread. *Item* they say that it is called bread, because it was bread before the consecration. Which also is false. For the Lords body was never bread. To such figures, Rhethorick affords no name.

They bring indeed for example, *Moses* Rod, which is still called a rod after it was turned into a Serpent: and the water of the wedding of *Cana*, which is still called water after it was turned into wine. Which are examples making against them. For of that rod it is expressly said, that it was *turned into a Serpent*, *Exod.* 4.3. And of that water it is said in expresse termes that *it was turned into wine*, *John* 2. 9. But of the bread of the holy Supper, it is not said that it was converted into flesh. Of this Serpent one might have truly said that it John 2.

was once a rod: and of this wine, that it was once water, becauſe it was the ſame matter clothed with another forme. But of Chriſts body it cannot be ſayd truely that ever it was bread. The matter or ſubſtance of the body of Chriſt, is not the matter of the bread. For Chriſts body is not made of bread, and was never bread.

Others ſay, that the Apoſtle ſaith not, *When ye eate bread*, but when ye eate *of this bread*, underſtanding by the pronoune *This*, a ſpirituall and heavenly bread. But they conſider not that the Apoſtle in the firſt to the *Corinthians*, Chapter 10, ſaith not *THIS BREAD*: but *the bread that we breake*. And Saint *Luke* in the 20 of the *Acts*, 7 Verſe. *The Diſciples came together to break bread*. There, their Philoſophy fayles them. They muſt alſo learne that when the Scripture taketh this word *Bread* in a ſpirituall ſenſe, it is never oppoſed to the cup: becauſe that when the queſtion is of a ſpirituall foode, to eate and to drinke are but one and the ſame thing. But Saint *Paul* oppoſeth this bread to that cup, ſaying, *Let every man eate of this bread, and drinke of this cup.*

That

That if any one consider exactly all the termes which our Adversaries use in this matter, hee shall perceive that they be unintelligible figures. They say that the Priest breaketh the hoste, and that this hoste is the body of Christ, which nevertheless cannot be broken. They say they lift up God, but God cannot be lifted up. They say the consecrated hoste is round: And that Christs body is in the consecrated hoste. Whence will follow in good Logick, that the body of Christ is round. Which, nevertheless, they doe not beleeve. They grant both propositions, and deny the conclusion. Which is against common sense.

And when they speake of drinking the cup, by drinking, they understand a swallowing downe of flesh and bones, and the Soule of Christ with his Divinity.

This confession of *Berengarius* is to be found in the 2 Distinction of the Consecration at the Canō. *Ego Berengarius.*

The Roman Councell under *Nicholas* the second, prescribed to *Berengarius* a forme of abjuration of his doctrine, in the most exquisite and formall tearmes that ever they could devise. These tearmes are, that *he protesteth to stand and keepe himselfe close to the doctrine of the Pope and Church of* Rome, *to wit*, that

*that the bread and the wine which are upon the Altar, are not onely the Sacrament, but also the very body and blood of Christ,* Words that must be taken in a quite contrary sense: For the Church of *Rome* beleeveth not that the bread is the true body of Christ. *Item* they make him say *that Christs body is sensiblie handled by the Priest, and is broken and crushed with the teeth of the faithfull,* But the Doctors Glosse noteth in the margent these wordes. *Except thou understand aright* Berengarius *his words, thou shalt fall into a greater herisie than* Berengarius *did.* It is the property of untruth, to intangle it selfe with figures, and not to understand it selfe.

## CHAP. XIII.

### *Of the Ascension of the Lord and of his absence: and of that our Adversaries say, that in the Sacrament he is Sacrmentally present.*

ABove all things the Glosses and figures of our Adversaries are intolerable

tolerable, when as they wreſt the places of Scripture wherin mention is made of Chriſts Aſcenſion and of his departure out of this world.

The Lord in the 12 Chapter of Saint *John*, 8 Verſe, ſaith, *The poore ye have alwayes, but me ye have not alwayes.* And in the 14 Chapter, 3 Verſe. *If I goe, I will come againe*, ſpeaking of his returne at the day of judgement. And in the chapter 17. 10. ſpeaking of his Aſcenſion neare at hand, as if it were paſt, he ſaith, *Now I am no more in the World.* Saint *Peter* in the third Chapter of the Acts of the Apoſtles, ſaith, *Heaven muſt containe him, untill the times of the reſtitution of all things*, which is the day of judgement.

All theſe words are as many lies, if we beleeve the Tranſubſtantiation. For in theſe places Chriſt ſaith that he hath left the world, and is no more in the world, and that we ſhall not have him alwayes. But if we beleeve the Tranſubſtantiation, we muſt ſay Chriſt hath not left the world, but is much more preſent than he was before his aſcenſion. For then he was but in one place at once upon earth, but now they will have him to be preſent upon a million of Altars, in boxes, and in bellies.

And for to conclude that place of Saint *Peter* which saith, *that Heaven must containe him* untill the day of restitution: the Latin version of the *Roman* Church hath put, *Heaven must receive him*, as if when S. *Peter* said these words, Christ was not yet ascended. And it is false that heaven doth receive Christ continually untill the day of Judgement. The *Lovain* Doctors, which have trãslated the Bible into *French*, have acknowledged the same wherefore they have turned faithfully, *Who heaven must contain*. And *Emanuel Sa* the Jesuite, in his Notes upon this place, *Recipere, id est, receptum continere. To receive*, that is to say, *to containe him after he be received*. Christ then must be contained in heaven, & not be still upon earth.

They rid themselves as ill out of the other places. They say, that when Christ saith, *He leaveth the world and is no more in the world*, it must be understood concerning his visible presence. So they make without word of God, 2 sorts of Christs presence, the one visible, the other invisible. And make Christ say, *I goe away, but I will remaine invisibly: I leave you, but my body shall be alwayes with you*. Now in conscience, could a man that had Christs body and soule in his mouth, say that

Christ

Christ is not present, under colour that he sees him not? By the same reason one may say, that a man hath no soule, because it is invisible, and that a man hath left the towne, when he lyeth hid in it.

What more? Christ himselfe in the 13. of Saint *Marke*, 21. verse, warnes us that there will come a time in which they shall say unto us, *Loe, here is Christ, or loe he is there*: and forbids us to beleeve it. And in the 24. chapter of Saint *Matthew*, he addeth: *If any man shall say unto you, he is in the closets or in the cup-boards*, (for the *Greek word ταμίαις*, signifieth that) *beleeve it not.* Truly he speaketh evidently of the places wherein they shall say that Christ is hidden. And speaketh in the plurall *in ταμίοις, in closets*, as of a Christ which shall be thought to be in severall places at once.

But Christ refuteth plainly all these shifts and evasions of our Adversaries, when as to comfort his Disciples, sorrowfull for his departure, he promiseth them to send them the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost. According to the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, hee should have said, *I goe away, but that shall not hinder mee from being present in your* John 14. 16. 26. & chap. 15. 26.

*mouths, and in your ſtomacks, and I ſhall be more preſent unto you than I am now.* He ſaith not a word of all that unto them, but comforting them for his departure, he promiſeth them his holy Spirit.

Saint *Paul* in the ſecond to the *Corinthians*, chap. 5. 8. ſaith, *We are willing rather to be abſent from the body, and to be preſent with the Lord.* And to the *Philippians*, chap. 1. 23. *My deſire is to depart and to be with Chriſt.* Had this Apoſtle loſt his wits? For according to the Popiſh doctrine he ſhould have ſaid, *I am already with Chriſt, I do carry him in my hands, I have him in my ſtomacke.*

S. *Auſtin* upon that is very expreſſe, in his 50. Treatiſe upon S. *John*, where he ſaith: *According to the Majeſtie of the Lord, according to his unſpeakable and inviſible grace is accompliſh'd that which he ſaid, I will be with you at all times till the conſummation of the world. But according to his fleſh which the world hath taken, and as he is born of the Virgin, &c. he ſaid, Ye ſhall not have mee alwaies.* And in the firſt Treatiſe upon the firſt of *John*, * *Wee cannot more handle him with our hands, now that he ſitteth in heaven, but well may we touch him by faith.* He ſpeaketh to the Prieſts of theſe times, who bragge to have Chriſt

* *Ipſum jam in cælo ſedentem manu contrectare nō poſſumus, ſed fide contingere.*

in

in their hands. And in the 78. Treatise upon S. *John*, * *Christ was going away as being a man, and withdrew not himself as he is God*, And in the 30 Treatise, † *The Lords body in which he is risen, must be in one place onely, but his truth is spread every where.* There is in the Latin, *in uno loco esse oportet*, and not, *in uno loco esse potest*, according to the new editions falsified. * *Gratian*, *Ivo Carnutensis*, *Lombard*, *Thomas*, *Gabriel Biel*, and the old editions of Saint *Austin* have *oportet*. Reason also requireth it. For it would be repugnant to common sense to say, that *the body of Christ may be in one place*: as if one should say, that the Sunne may be in one place, it were to say that it may be in no place.

*Cyril* of *Alexandria* in his eleventh booke upon Saint *John*, chap. 3. * *Though he be absent in body, appearing for us before his Father, and sitting at his right hand, he dwelleth in his Saints through his Spirit.* He supplyeth the want of his corporall presence by giving his Spirit, and not in keeping himselfe hidden under the accidents of bread.

The *Eutychian* hereticks spake as our

* *A quibus homo abscedebat, Deus non recedebat.*

† *Corpus Domini in quo resurrexit, in uno loco esse oportet, veritas ejus ubique diffusa est.*

* *Gratianus Dist. 2. de Consecr: Can. prim. Ivo 2. parte Decreti c. 18. Lombard, lib. 4. Sentent. Dist. 10. A. Thomas 3. parte summæ qu. 75. art. 1. Gabriel Biel Lect. 39. in Canonem Missæ. Etsi absest corpore, Patri pro nobis apparens ac à dextris ejus sedens, habitat tamen in Sanctis per Spiritum.*

adversa-

Adversaries doe. For they said, that Christs body is present on earth, as well as in heaven, by an invisible presence. Against whom, whither *Vigil*, or *Gelasius* Pope hath written five Bookes, in the first whereof he speaketh thus: * *The Sonne of God according to his humanity, hath left us, and withdrawne himselfe from us. But according to his divinitie he saith unto us, I will be with you till the consummation of the world.* And in the 4 Booke: † *When Christs flesh was upon earth, it was not in Heaven, and now that it is in Heaven, it is not on earth.* Even as *Vigilius*, saying that when Christs flesh was upon earth, it was not in heaven, understood it was not in heaven neither visibly nor invisibly. So when he saith, that now it is no more on earth, he meaneth it is not there, neither visibly nor invisibly. That if he meant or understood that Christs flesh is present unto us invisibly, then would he plead the *Eutychians* cause, for that was their opinion.

To be short, the Apostle to the *Ephesians*, chap. 3. 17. saith, *that Christ dwelleth in our hearts by faith*, and not in our stomacks in the midst of meat.

When we aske of them after what manner the body of Christ is present in the

* Vigil. l. 1. *Dei filius secundum humanitatem suam recessit à nobis. Secundum divinitatẽ suã ait nobis, Ecce sum vobiscum usq; ad consummationem seculi.*

† Lib. 4. *Quando in terra fuit, non erat utiq; in cœlo. Et nunc quia in cœlo est, non est utiq; in terra.*

the Sacrament, they answer, that it is not present there circumscriptively, as wine is enclosed in a tunne or caske, nor definitively, as immateriall spirits: But that it is Sacramentally present. This answer truly is ridiculous. For, to say that Christ is in the Sacrament sacramentally present, is a thing as absurd as to say that a man which is in a Temple, is there Templarily present, and he that is in a Coach, is present in it Coacharily. Moreover, it is certaine that by this answer they come to be of our side. For they say themselves that this word, *Sacrament*, signifieth a *sacred signe*. Therefore to be present sacramentally, signifieth no other thing, but to be present significatively, and by figure and representation,

## CHAP. XIV.

## CHAP. XIV.

*Confession of our Adversaries, acknowledging that Transubstantiation is not grounded in the Scriptures. That the Primitive Church did consecrate by the prayer, and not by these words,* This is my body.

THe most learned of the Roman Church ground their *Transubstantiation* not upon these words, *This is my body*, but upon the authority of the Church of *Rome*, which, as they hold, cannot erre.

*Scotus*, which is termed the subtle Doctor, upon the fourth of the Sentences *Dist.* 11. *quest.* 3. saith: *There is no place to be found in the Scripture, that may without the determination of the Church, compell a man to beleeve the Transubstantiation.* Upon which place, Cardinall *Bellarmine* in his 3. booke of the Eucharist chap. 23. speaketh thus:* *Scotus saith that there is no*

* *Secundo dicit non extare locũ ullũ Scripturæ tam expressum, ut sine declaratione Ecclesiæ evidenter cogat Trãsubstantiationem admittere. Et id non est omnino improbabile. Nam etsi Scriptura quam nos suprà adduximus, videatur nobis tã clara, ut possit cogere hominẽ non protervum: tamen an ità sit merito dubitari potest, cum homines doctissimi & accuratissimi, quales imprimis Scotus fuit, contrarium sentiant.*

place

place in the Scripture so expresse, as to compell evidently without the declaration of the Church, to receive the Transubstantiation. And that is not altogether improbable. For although the Scripture that we have alleaged, seeme to us so plaine that it may compell a man not proud or insolent, yet nevertheless it may justly be doubted whether it be so or no, seeing the most acute and learned men, such especially as Scotus was, are of a contrary opinion. And in the same place he tels us, that Scotus saith, that Transubstantiation was not an article of faith before the Councell of Lateran, held Anno 1215. For that cause Vasquez the Jesuite upon the 3. part of Thomas, Disp: 180. chap. 5. having represented the opinion of Scotus, who saith, * that the truth of the words of consecration might have beene preserved, though the substance of the bread and wine had remained in the Eucharist, (to whom also Durand joyneth himselfe) blameth Bellarmine without naming him, for saying, that the opinion of Scotus is probable, & accuseth him of halting on both sides. We see † (saith he) certaine professors in Divinity in our times, who halting a little on both sides, do not esteeme improbable that which Scotus hath said touching the words of consecration.

* Scotus docet potuisse servari veritatem verborum consecrationis, etiamsi in Eucharistia maneret substantia panis & vini.

† Videas aliquos Theologiæ Professores nostri tẽporis qui in una trãq; parte aliquantulum claudicãtes non putant improbabile id quod Scotus de verbis consecrationis dixit.

Of

Of that number of learned and acut
men, was Cardinall *Cajetan*, who in hi
notes upon *Thomas*, speaketh thus: * Th
other point which the Gospel expoundeth n
expressly, we have received it from the Churc
to wit, the conversion of the bread into th
body of Christ.

* Cajetanus in 3. Thomæ q. 75. art. 1. *Alterum quod Evangelium non explicavit expresse, ab Ecclesia accepimus, scil. conversionem panis in corpus Christi.*

*Item. Conversio non explicate habetur in Evangelio.* The conversion (of the bread) is not to be found explicitly in the Gospel.

† Petr. de Alliaco in 4. Sent. q. 6. art. 2. *Patet quod ille modus est possibilis, nec repugnat rationi, nec authoritati Bibliæ: immo est facilior ad*

The Cardinall *de Alliaco*, † It appeare that this manner which supposeth that th substance of bread remaines still, is possible, neither is it contrary to reason, nor to the authority of the Bible, but is more easie to conceive, and more reasonable. And for this cause he is checked by *Vasquez* the Jesuite in the 2 Tome upon the 3 part of *Thomas*, Disp: 180. cap: 5. And in that same place he saith that *Durand* followed the opinion of *Scotus* upon the 4. of the *Sentences*, *Disp.* 11. *quæst.* 2.

*Gabriel Biel* in the 40 lesson upon the Canon of the Masse: * *How the body of Christ is there, whether it be by conversion of*

*intelligendum, & rationabilior quàm aliquis aliorum.* * Biel Lect. 40. *Quomodo ibi sit Christi corpus, an per conversionem alicujus in ipsum, an sine conversione incipiat esse corpus Christi cum pane, manentibus substantia & accidentibus panis, non invenitur expressum in canone Bibliæ.*

some

*some thing into it, or whether without conversion Christs body beginnes to be there with the bread, the substance and the accidents remaining, it is not expressed in the Canon of the Bible.* And even there: *That hath beene proved by the authority of the Church and of the Saints, for that cannot be proved by reason.*

The same* in the 41 lesson asketh, *Why the Saints and the Church have chosen to say and determine that that should be understood in so difficult a manner: seeing the Scriptures may be expounded and kept in their soundnesse, in a manner easie to be understood.* To this he answereth, that *the Chuch hath determined it so*, meaning by the Church, not the *Syrian*, nor the *Greeke* or *Ethiopian*, but the *Roman* Church onely.

*Salmeron* the Jesuite in the thirteenth Treatise of the ninth Tome, expounding these words *This is my body*, speaketh thus: [b] *Certainely these words doe not signifie that any conversion be made, by the force of the words. Otherwise he that should say this is my body, in shewing his owne body, would signifie that some thing is converted into his body.* And he insistes very much upon this, that these words *This*

* *Sed cur hunc intellectum difficilem Sancti dicere & Ecclesia determinare elegerunt, cum scripturæ possint exponi & salvari secundum intellectum facilem de hoc articulo.*

[b] § Secunda. *Profectò illis verbis nequaquam conversio significatur ex vi verborum. Aliàs qui diceret Hoc est corpus meum, demonstrando suum corpus, significaret conversionem alicujus rei in suum corpus.*

*is my body*, are declarative or significative of the thing which is, and not effective of that which is not.

Wherefore the same Jesuite, in the same Treatise, joynes himselfe to the opinion of Pope *Innocent* the third, who in the fourth booke of the Mysteries of the Masse, Chapters 6. and 17. teacheth that Christ made not the conversion of the bread by these words *Hoc est corpus meum*, but by his divine power, and by the blessing that had preceded. For he will have the pronouncing of these words to have another vertue at this day in the mouthes of Priests, than they had in the mouth of Christ. Which opinion of *Innocent* the third, is followed by *Innocent* the fourth, his Successor, and by multitudes of Doctors, which *Salmeron* produceth * in the same Treatise.

[a] Inno. 3. Lib 4. de Myster. Missæ cap. 6. *Sane dici potest quod Christus virtute divina confecit, & postea formâ expressit, &c. Et cap. 17. Ab hujus quæstionis laqueo facile se absolvit qui dicit, quod Christus tunc confecit cum benedicit.*

* 5. Porro pag. 82.

It is credible that these Popes and Doctors were moved to teach that Christ did not consecrate by these words *This is my body*, but by the prayer of blessing he made before, because the Fathers say the same, and that such was the beleefe of the ancient Church. *Justin Martyr* [b] calleth that which we receive in the Eucharist *a foode consecrated*

[b] Την δι' εὐχῆς τοῦ λόγου παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν.

crated by the prayer of the Word, that is to say Christ. Saint Austin in the third booke of the Trinity, Chapter 4. speaking of that which we receive in the Sacrament, saith that *it is taken of the fruits of the earth, & prece mystica consecratum, and is consecrated by the mysticall prayer.* Origen in his eight booke against Celsus: * *We eate loaves of bread which by the prayer are made one bodie, which is some holy thing.* Ireneus in his fourth Booke, Chapter 34. *The bread receiving the invocation of God, is no more common bread, but Eucharist.* Basil in the first booke of the holy Ghost, 27 Chapter, calleth the words of consecration τὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ῥήματα, *the words of invocation.* Isidorus in the sixth booke of Origines, in the Chapter *de Officijs*: * *The Sacrifice is so called, as if one should say a sacred deede, because it is consecrated by the mysticall prayer in remembrance of the Passion which the Lord suffered for us.* Yet at this day the Greek Churches consecrate by the prayer, as Bellarmin acknowledgeth in the fourth Booke of the Eucharist, Chapter * 12. See the Canon *Corpus* in the second distinction of the consecration.

† Ἅγιος ἐσόμενον σῶμα γενόμενος δι' ἐπικλήσεως.

* *Qui est à terra panis percipiens vocationem Dei, jam non est panis communis, sed Eucharistia.*

* *Sacrificium dictum quasi sacrum factum, quia prece mystica consecratur in memoriam pro nobis dominicæ passionis.*

* § *Habemus.*

By this it is as cleare as the light, that

the Ancient Fathers did not beleeve that by these words *This is my body*, any conversion of the bread was made.

## CHAP. XV.

### *Of the Adoration of the Sacrament. The opinion of the* Roman *Church.*

THe *Roman* Church having deified the Sacrament, hath consequently obliged her selfe to worship it with the highest adoration which is due to God alone. By this meanes a wafer of bread hath taken Gods place, and is called God, and is worshipped as God. They speake of lifting up God in the Masse, and of Gods feast (*viz.*, *Corpus Christi* day) and of carrying God to a sicke body. Phrases that are not to bee found in the holy Scriptures, and unheard off in the Ancient Christian Church.

The Councell of *Trent* in the thirteenth Session, Chapter 5. speaketh thus:

*Ther*

*There remaines no doubt but that all faithfull Christian people ought to give the worship of Latria, which is due to the true God, to this holy Sacrament in the veneration.* Now by this word *Sacrament*, they understand the body of Christ with the *species* or accidents. For by this word *Sacrament*, our Adversaries never understand Christ Jesus out of the *species*. This Councell then ordaineth that the *species* of the bread and wine shall be worshipped with soveraigne adoration.

The practise doth verifie what I say. For the people worshipping the consecrated hoste, divide not their minde into two Adorations, and worship not the body of Christ with one kinde of Adoration, and the *species* of the bread with an other: but carry their whole devotion to worship with soveraigne adoration, the hoste they have before their eyes.

*Bellarmin* teacheth as much in his fourth Booke of the Eucharist, Chapter 29. * *We say that Christ, Per se & proprie, is to be worshipped with the adoration of Latria, and that this adoration belongeth also to the signes or symboles of the bread and wine, in as much as they are conceived or considered, as being one with*

*Nullus dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Christi fideles latriæ cultum qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo Sacramento in veneratione adhibeant.*

* §. Sed hæc. *Cultum latriæ dicimus per se & proprie Christum esse adorandum, & eam adorationem ad symbola etiam panis & vini pertinere, quatenus appræhenduntur ut quædam unum cum ipso Christo quem continent.*

*Christ himselfe, whom they containe.* And ſaith, it was juſt ſo that Chriſts garmen were worſhipped with the ſame adora tion that Chriſt was. For (ſaith he) they did not pull off his cloaths for t worſhip him.

For he propoſeth this for an infallib Maxime, that *hee that worſhippeth ſo thing, worſhippeth alſo all the things th are conjoyned to it.* That is to ſay that h that worſhippeth the Images, wo ſhips alſo the Cobwebs that are upo them: And that he that worſhippeth th Pope, worſhippeth alſo his Breech and his ſhirt. Hee will have then th roundneſſe, whiteneſſe, length, breadth and taſte of the hoſte, to be worſhipp with the ſame adoration that God i worſhipped with, becauſe theſe acciden and Chriſt are but one.

Bell lib. de Imaginibus cap. 25 *Qui adorat aliquem, adorat ea omnia quæ cum ipſo conjuncta ſunt.*

*Vaſquez* the Jeſuite ſaith the ſam in his ſecond Booke of *Adoration*, Diſp 9. Chapter 1. * *Chriſts humanity* (ſaith he) *and the Euchariſt are worſhipped ab ſolutely with the adoration of Latria, alb it that being conjoyned by accident with t God-head, a worſhippe is given to them* And that we may know that the acci dents of the bread, that is to ſay th breadth, length, colour and ſavour o

* *Quæ abſolute dicuntur adorari adoratione latriæ, cum tamen per accidens cũ divinitate conjuncta colantur.*

the

the bread are worshipped with the same adoration that Christ is worshipped: he addeth, * *The accidents of the bread and wine, because they exist not by their proper existence, but by the existence of the body and blood of Christ, may very well receive the same honour of adoration together with the body and blood of Christ: even as Christs humanitie and his Divinitie are worshipped with one and the same motion of adoration.*

This Idolatry is prodigious, by which the colour and roundnesse of the bread are worshipped with the same adoration that God is worshipped with. The *Ægyptians* did seeme to have attained to the highest degree of Idolatry when they did worship *Cats*, *Onions*, and *Storkes*. But this Idolatry, in worshipping the accidents of the bread, goes farre beyond them: For these things they worshipped, were substances and things really existing: But these accidents without a subject, are imaginary things, and which indeed are nothing. The folly of those *Ægyptians* would have beene much greater, if they had worshipped the colour and the length, and the faces or lowring of a Cat, without worshipping the Cat. Adde moreover

* *Accidentia panis & vini cum existat non propria existentia sed existentia corporis & sanguinis Christi, optime possit simul sub eundem cultum adorationis cadere quemadmodum humanitas Christi ejusque divinitas eodem motu adorationis coluntur.*

over that they did not worſhip beaſts and plants as the Soveraigne God; but as having in them ſome ſparkes of the Divinity. But the *Roman* Church worſhippeth the accidents of bread without bread, with a Soveraigne adoration, and which onely belongeth to God.

And marke the doctrine of this Jeſuite, who ſaith with approbation of the Examinators prefixed in the forefront of his booke, that the accidents of the bread doe exiſt in Chriſt after the ſame manner as the humanitie of Chriſt hath no proper ſubſiſtence, but ſubſiſteth in the divine nature. This truely is to unite and conjoyne the roundneſſe and colour of the bread with Chriſt with a perſonall union.

And as errors are link'd together and cleave one to an other, it is certaine that the accidents of the bread are not more ſtraitly conjoyned with Chriſt, than Chriſt with theſe accidents. And by conſequent even as becauſe of this imaginary union of the body of Chriſt with the accidents of the bread, the things which befall theſe accidents, are alſo attributed unto the body of Chriſt, of which they ſay, it is carryed, and

lifted

lifted up, and walked up and downe, and stolne away, and eaten by mice, and vomited up, and devoured by a beast: So by the same reason because of the same union, they must say that the roundnesse and whitenesse of the bread are the Sonne of God, and are borne of the Virgin, and are just and without originall sinne.

In all this truely the *Roman* Church sheweth her selfe idolatrous in the last degree. It is a bog or quagmire of abuses, and an *abyssus* or a gulfe of seduction wherein *Satan* hath plunged men: God punishing in his just anger the contempt of his word, which is become an unknowne Booke among the people. For it is just that those that have lost Piety, should loose also the common sense.

## CHAP. XVI.

*Examen of the Adoration of the Sacrament by the word of God. That the Ancient Christians did not worship the Sacrament.*

IF the Scriptures had with our Adversaries any authority, this controversie would soone be decided.

Every action that concernes Gods Service, and specially Adoration, is to be done in Faith, and not with doubts and conjectures, as Saint *James* saith, Chapter first: *Let him aske in Faith nothing wavering*: And Saint *Paul*, *Rom.* 14. saith *that whatsoever is not of Faith, is sinne.* And the same Apostle to the *Hebrewes*, Chapter 11. *It is impossible without Faith to please God.* Now it is impossible that the people of the *Roman* Church should worship the *hoste* of the Masse in faith: Because God hath not commanded it in his word. For as Saint *Paul* saith, *Rom.* 10. *Faith commeth by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.*

In

In generall we have the Lords commandement ſaying, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him onely ſhalt thou ſerve.* Hee ſpeaketh of the Soveraigne God, Creator and Governour of the World, and not of a God made with words, that is made of bread, ſubject to falling, to be vomited up, and ſtolne away. Certainly, to worſhip ſuch a god as that, is to violate the Commandement of the Law, which ſaith: *Thou ſhalt have no other God before me.*

In vaine doe they anſwer that Chriſt ought to be worſhipped, ſince hee is God: For, beſides that they preſuppoſe that which is not, to wit, that this bread is tranſubſtantiated into the body of Chriſt, they declare themſelves that in this Sacrament Chriſts body is not onely worſhipped: but alſo the roundneſſe, colour, and ſavour of the bread.

That if any religious worſhip were to be given to this Sacrament, ſome trace of it would be found in the Inſtitution of the holy Supper, and ſome commandement of the Lord: But neither trace nor appearance of that is to be found. But rather we ſee that the Apoſtles ſate at the table during this action,

on, as it appeareth by what is said in Saint *John* 13. 12. that Christ *after he had taken his garments, he sate downe again.* During which repast Saint John was leaning on Jesus bosome, *Verse* 23. And Saint *Paul* relating the Institution of the Lord, saith: *I have received of the Lord that which I delivered unto you.* Since then hee doth not speake of any adoration of the Sacrament, it is certaine hee had not received it of the Lord, and beleeved not that the Church was obliged to worship the Sacrament.

The ordinary shift of our Adversaries, is to say that the Apostles worshipped not the consecrated hoste, because they had Christ every day with them, and must have beene continually kneeling before him.

I answer that to eate Christ with their teeth, and receive him in their mouthes, and sacrifice him in sacrifice propitiatory, are actions which were new to the Apostles, and which necessarily required Adoration. Every Sacrifice is performed in the worshipping of him to whom the Sacrifice is offered up. These things so extraordinary and admirable (if they were true) did well deserve

deserve an extraordinary veneration. Specially in the first Institution which was to serve for a rule unto the Church, and a patterne to conforme her selfe unto.

And since our Adversaries will have Christ in the holy Supper to have eaten himselfe, he might by the same reason worship himselfe, and bowe the knee before himselfe, which is a very merry and recreative conception, and sutable unto Transubstantiation.

Whereupon we give our Adversaries the choice. Will they have Christ to have adored the consecrated hoste? But it would follow from thence, according to their doctrine, that Christ had worshipped his owne selfe, and that he was holyer than himselfe. And it is certain that he that worshippeth, and he that is worshipped, are two persons. Will they have Christ not to have worshipped the consecrated hoste? But it will follow from thence that the Apostles, neither then, nor since, never worshipped it. For Christ saying unto them, *Doe this*, commanded them to doe as he had done.

That if the Lord would have had the Apostles to have worshipped the Sacra-

ment

ment he would have made an elevation of the hoste, as was observed in al Sacrifices for to binde the sacrificers and the assistants to the adoration. A thing nevertheless which Christ did not doe: for he offered up nothing to his Father. He did not say, *Father receive this oblation:* But sayd to his Apostles, *Take, Eate.*

Even in the very time of *Tertullian* and of *Cyprian* (as we shall see hereafter) the custome of divers Christians, both men and women, was to carry into their houses the sacred bread they had received in the Church, to wrap it up in a cloth, and to lock it up at home in a chest or cupbord. A manifest proofe they worshipped not the Sacrament. For would they have permitted a woman to take God with her hand, put him up in her pocket, and keepe him locked up close at home?

*See Arnob. lib. 6. and Lactantius lib. 2. cap. 2.*

Would the Christians have upbraided the Pagans that they worshipped Statues that could not move themselves, nor rise when they were fallen, nor breathe, subject to rust, wherein mice make their nests, &c. if the Pagans might have upbraided them the same, and

and tell them that they worshipped an hoste that could not breath, nor rise up when it is fallen, nor open its eyes, nor stretch out its hands, that may be stolne by men, and eaten by mice, and will grow mouldie, &c?

Durst *Theodoret* have sayd in the 55 question upon *Genesis*, that *it is an extreame folly to worship that which one eateth*, if the Christians of his time had worshipped the Sacrament afore they ate it? It is this errour above all others that keepes the Pagans from embracing the Christian Religion, as *Averroes* testifieth, of whom *Salmeron* the Jesuite cites these words out of the 12 booke of his *Metaphysickes*. *Quoniam Christiani Deum suum quem adorant, manducant, sit anima mea cum Philosophis.* *Since Christians eate the God they worship, let my soule be with the Philosophers.*

ἀβελτηρίας ἐσχάτης τὸ ἐσθόμενον σεβεσθαι.

*Salmeron Tomo 9. Tract. 18. §. Ca ivi nus.*

The ancientest forme of celebrating the Eucharist in the Christian Church, is that which is described about the later end of the second Apologie of *Justin Martyr*, wherein no mention is made of any adoration: No more than in that which is extant in the booke of the *Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie* of *Denis*, who is surnamed *Areopagite*.

There

There are some places in the Fathers that say that Christ is worshipped in the Eucharist: but that makes nothing to this purpose. For the Father also and the Holy Ghost ought to be worshipped in the Eucharist. It is one thing to worship Christ in the action of the Sacrament, and another thing to worship the Sacrament. Yet notwithstanding, the third Councel of *Carthage* in the 23 Canon, forbids one to addresse his prayer to the Sonne in the Eucharist, in these words: *When any one assists at the Altar, let his prayer always be directed to the Father.* If then they had worshipped the consecrated hoste, doubtlesse it would not have beene forforbidden to invocate it.

*Cum ad altare assistitur, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio.*

There be also in Ancient Fathers some Oratorie Apostropho's, wherein they speake to the water of Baptisme, and to the bread and wine of the Eucharist: but that makes nothing for the adoration neither of the water nor of the bread. So the Scripture speakes often to heaven, to the Earth, to the Sea, to the Mountaines; yet none can inferre from thence that they must be worshipped.

Ambros. in Lucam cap 10. *O aqua quæ Sacramentum Christi esse meruisti.*

Of *Theodoret*, who in his 2. Dialogue saith

faith, that the signes are worshipped, shall be spoken hereafter. There is in the *Greeke* προσκυνεῖν, which cannot be understood of the soveraigne adoration, seeing he speakes of the signes or Symboles, which cannot be worshipped religiously, and with the worship of *Latria*, without manifest Idolatry. In the *Greeke* copies of the *African codex*, *Aurelius* Bishop of *Carthage*, is often called προσκυνητὴς: *Abraham* worshippeth, or rather prostrateth himselfe before the Sons of *Heth*, *Genes.* 23. vers. 7. & 12. And *Jacob* doth the same to his brother *Esau*, *Gen.* 33. 3. and *David* to *Jonathan*. 1. *Sam.* 20. 41. Whom nevertheless *Abraham*, and *Jacob*, and *David* esteemed not to be Gods: *Tertullian* against *Hermogenes*, chap. 22. saith, that he worshippeth the plenitude of the Scriptures. *Austin* in the 164 Epistle to *Emeritus*, *Baptismum Christi ubique veneramur*: *We worship every where the Baptisme of Christ*. Such manner of speeches ought to be understood according to the subject or matter in hand.

## CHAP. XVII.

## CHAP. XVII.

### *Of the Priests intention, without which the* Roman *Church believes no consecration, nor Transubstantiation is made.*

THe *Roman* Church holdeth, that if the Priest hath not intention to consecrate, and to doe what the Church doth, there is no consecration or Transubstantiation made. It is thus defined and determined by Pope *Eugenius* the 4. in the instruction of the *Armenians*, which is at the end of the Councell of *Florence*: And by the Councell of *Trent* in the 7. Session, Canon 11. in these words: * *If any one say that the intention to doe at least what the Church doth, is not requisite in the Ministers, let him be accursed.*

The Sacrament then being of no value, if the Priests intention be not to consecrate, it is impossible for the people to be assured that the consecration was made. For they know not what the intention and thought of the Priest was: only they presume it by conjecture. *God only knows the hearts of men*, 2. *Chron.* 6. 30. The adoration

* *Si quis dixerit in Ministris dum Sacramenta conficiunt, & conferunt, non requiri intentionē, saltem faciendi quod Ecclesia facit, anathema sit.*

ration therefore of the Hoste, is a conjecturall adoration, and which is done at all adventure, since no man is assured of the Priests intention, without which the Sacrament is of no value. *Bellarmin* confesses it ingenuously in his third Book of *Justification*, chap. 8. * *No man* (saith he) *can be certaine by the certitude of faith that he receives a true Sacrament, because it depends upon the intention of the Minister: And none can see another mans intention.* And truly this Cardinall hath reason to say that none can be certaine of it: for there are Priests that are Magitians, and there are examples of Priests convicted and punished for having consecrated in the name of the Devill. Even very lately there was one put to death at *Loudun*, accused of *Magicke* by the *Ursulins* Nunnes that were possest with the Devill. There be Priests Atheists & profane, that scoffe and jest at every thing they doe in the Church. I have knowne diverse Priests, who beeing converted to the true Religion, did confesse to have sung Masses for many yeares together against their intention, and detesting in their hearts what they did, and asked forgiveneſſe of God for that they had fought so long against their owne consciences. In all

* Dicent. *Nec, potest quis esse certus certitudine fidei se percipere verum Sacramentum, cum Sacramentū non conficiatur sine intentione Ministri, & intentionem alterius nemo videre possit.*

these Masses then no consecration was made.

By the same doctrine it appeares that the Priest doth not know whether he be a Priest or no. For he knowes not what the intention of his Ordinator was. Whence followeth that all the Masses he sings, and all the absolutions he giveth, remaine in suspence, and no man knowes whether they be of any force or value. Peradventure this Priest received the order of Priesthood of a Bishop that had intention, but this Bishop perhaps received his Orders of another Bishop that had no intention. And so mounting upwards, the uncertaintie encreaseth and multiplies it selfe *ad infinitum*. *Gabriel Biel* acknowledges the same in his Epitomie of the Canon of the Masse: *"No Priest (saith he) that celebrateth, can know evidently whether he be a Priest: for he cannot know evidently whether he be baptized, or whether he hath received the Ordination lawfully.*

* *Nullus celebrans potest evidenter scire se esse Sacerdotem, quia non potest evidenter scire se fore baptizatū, aut legitimè ordinatum.*

The Church then under the Old Testament had a great advantage over the Christian Church; for then the Salvation of Children depended not upon the intention of those that circumcised them, but on the onely grace of God,

and

and upon his Covenant, which is a stay infinitely more firme than the intention of men.

Pope *Adrian* the 6.* after the Councell of *Constance*, excuseth the simple people that worshippeth the unconsecrated Hoste, which they thinke to be consecrated, saying, the Hoste is not worshipped but with this condition, to wit, if the consecration be made as it ought, in saying, *Adoro te si tu es Christus: I worship thee if thou be Christ.* As saying: *I know not whether thou be Christ, or whether thou be not Christ; but howsoever, and at all adventure, I adore thee if thou be Christ.*

*Gerson* in his Treatise of the *Examen of Doctrines, Tome* 1. moves an objection drawne out of *Bonaventure*, touching the worshipping of the Eucharist which is thought to be consecrated though it be not. His answer after *Bonaventure* is such: [a] *It is an ordinary ease which alwaies carries this condition or implicite presupposition, that the Priest hath done as ought to be done in the Church, which condition needs*

* *Adrian. 6. Quodlib. Sect. 10. Suppositio 2. Fol. 70.* Consilium Constantiense excusat simplices adorantes hostiam non consecratam, quia tacite implicatur conditio, si consecratio sit recte facta.

*Et paulo post*, Si sic adoret, Adoro te si tu es Christus.

Consideration. 6.

[a] *Objicit idem Bonaventura de adoratione Eucharistiæ quæ' pue non consecratæ in manibus Sacerdotis. Respondet casum communem esse, qui semper implicitam habet conditionem vel presuppositionem, quod Sacredos secerit secundum debitum Ecclesiæ ritum.*

not to be expressed in the adoration. Nevertheless this adoration frees it selfe from being a sinne, because it is the custome of the faithfull: whereof we have an example in the worshipping of Images. These Doctors will have the Hoste and Images of Saints to be worshipped upon these conditions, viz: if the consecration was duly made, and if those Images be Images of true Saints, and if those Saints heare us: Which be things that one must guesse at piously, and be contented with conjectures, and be saved by custome. As if a wife doubting whether he that hath lien with her, were her husband or no, should say unto him, *I have received you, but under this presupposition, that you are my husband: I have indeed lien with you, but it was under this condition, if you were my husband.* The faith of the faithfull is not grounded upon conjectures, it worships not a conjecturall God, not knowing whether he be a God or no God.

The force of this intention is so great, that *Vasquez* the Jesuite saith, * *It is most certaine that the power of consecrating was committed unto Priests, so that if they would consecrate to a bad use, viz: as for poysonings, or enchantments, the consecration nevertheless should have its effect.* By this meanes

* *Vasquez in 3 part. Thomæ Tomo 3. Disp. 171. num. 17.* Constat Sacerdotibus cōmissam fuisse potestatem consecrandi, ita ut si vellent cōsecrare in malū usū, nempe proveneficiis & incantationibus cōsecratio eorum effectum haberet.

Christ

Christ shall be in the power of a Magician, and shall become the sport or pastime of the Devill. Would God have given unto Priests a power against God himselfe, which he will not take from them when they employ it in the service of the Devill?

But upon this intention mens consciences are marvelously confounded and troubled, and their Doctors know not at what passe they be. For if a Priest hath before him a great houshold-loafe, and his intention is but to consecrate one halfe of it, without cutting it into two pieces: how shall a man discerne Christs body which is in that bread, from the unconsecrated bread? And if the Priest hath before him a dozen of wafer cakes, and his intention is but to consecrate ten of them, if these Hostes come to be mingled together, how shall he discern the consecrated ones from those that are not cõsecrated? How shall he discern his God from the wafers of common bread? Is it possible that Christ did not leave unto Christians any meanes to know with certainty whether his body be present under the *species*, or whether it be not: lest they should pollute themselves with Idolatrie?

Vpon this adoration it must be observed, that the Councell of *Trent* * ordaineth that the Sacrament be worshipped. Now all the Doctors with an unanimous consent, after Saint *Austin*, define that this word Sacrament, signifieth a *sacred signe*. This Councell then ordains that the signe be worshipped. That if by the *sacred signe* Christ himsefe must be understood, Christ shall be the signe and the figure of himselfe, as *Bellarmin* [a] saith in the 24. chapter of his second Booke of the *Eucharist*: [a] *The same Christ was the figure of himselfe.*

In this point of adoration, God in his just judgement hath given our adversaries over into a reprobate sense. For when the Hoste is fallen into some filthy place, or is vomited up through drunkennesse, they worship it thus defiled, as *Vasquez* teaches in his 3 Tome, upon the 3 part of *Thomas*, *Disput.* 195. *chap.* 5. [b] *That is* (saith he) *the common opinion of the Church, which would worship as a true Sacrament the species taken out of a filthy place, or vomited up againe by a brute beast: for there is no reason to say that Christs body ceaseth to be under them before they be corrupted.* And in the same [c] place he teacheth, that if a dumbe creature hath eaten the conse-

* *Sess.* 13. *cap.* 5.

* § Producunt.

[a] *Idē Christus sui ipsius figura fuit.*

[b] Vasq. 3. Tom. in 3. partem Thomæ Disp. 195. cap. 5. *Hoc est cōtra communem sensum Ecclesiæ, quæ species è loco sordido erutas, tanquā verum Sacramentum veneraretur.*

[c] *Cap.* 43.

consecrated Hostes, and drunken the consecrated cup, this beast shall grow fat with them, and may be made drunke with it, and its belly shall swell. It will then be drunke with accidents, and fatten with roundnesses and lines.

The words of this Jesuite, in the beginning of the 4 chapter of the same Dispute, are such: * *It may come to passe that a beast that hath eaten the species of the Sacrament, shall not be lesse nourished with the then if it had eaten bread and wine not consecrated; yea it may fall out that this beast may be made drunk therewith, & her belly stretch & swell.* To be short, by this doctrine that beast may burst for having eaten God.

For to avoid this ignominie and preserve Christ from these inconveniences, certaine Doctors of the *Roman* Church, and namely *Bonaventure* have esteemed that so soon as a beast hath devoured the consecrated Hoste, or that it hath beene cast into the dirt or in a privie, Christs body withdrawes himselfe, and the substance of the bread returnes by a second transubstantiation no lesse admirable than the first. But Pope † *Gregory* the eleventh

* *Accidere potest ut animal quod species Sacramenti sumpsit, non minus nutriatur quàm si panem & vinum non consecratũ manducet. Immo etiã accidere potest ut animal inebrietur, & venter ejus distẽdatur.*

† Vasquez in 3 part. Thomæ Disp. 195. cap 5. § *Verum Greg. 11. in Directorio Inquisitorum 3. p. 4. 10. damnavit asserentes sub hostia consecrata, projecta in lutum, aut locum sordidum, non manere corpus Christi.*

venth in his *Directorie* of Inquisitors part. 2. quest. 20. condemnes this opinion: and that conformably to the opinion of *Thomas*, and of *Scotus*, and of the *Jesuites*, who hold generally that the body of Christ is taken really by a beast, and that mice may carry it away.

## CHAP. XVIII.

*That our Adversaries in this matter intangle themselves into absurdities, and insoluble contradictions.*

IT is hard to beleeve a man that beleeves not his own selfe, and that contradicts himselfe, and heapes up together so many absurdities, that it seemes he is afraid other men should beleeve him. This maxime is true without exception, that two things contradictorie cannot both be true. Our Adversaries themselves confesse that it passeth the omnipotencie of God, and that hee cannot doe that a thing be and be not at one and the same time: that *Cæsar* be a man indeed and not be a reasonable creature. That a round figure be square whilst it is round.

Against

Against this rule do our adversaries offend, destroying the definition of things, and affirming things which are incompatible, and heaping together in this matter a thousand absurdities, whereof we will specifie some.

1 They say that in the Masse the Priest with 5 words makes the body of Christ, which nevertheless was already before the Priest made it. They speak as if should say, that whilest *Philip* is at *Paris*, some body makes him at *Rome*. To make a thing which is already, and to destroy a thing which is not, are like absurdities.

2 If a man be in this chamber who was not in it the day before, it must needs follow that either he came thither from elsewhere, or was borne in it. But in the Masse they say that Christ is not there before the consecration, and that after the consecration he is there, and yet that he came not thither: It follows then that he was borne there, or freshly formed, though he was already before.

3 They say that the *Species* of the bread and wine (for they speake after that manner) contain the body of Christ, and yet containe it not, for it is in heaven. This is a ridiculous contradiction,

to

to will that a body be out of that whi
containes it, for thence will follow th
the thing which containeth it, contain
it not.

4 They say that the Lords body wi
all its bigneſſe and length is contained
the leaſt crumme of the Hoſte, and in t
leaſt drop of the chalice, ſo that if t
point of a pinne were dipt in the con
crated cup, the Lords body would
whole in that drop that ſhould hang
the end of the pinne. Whence follow
eth that the contained is greater th
the continent, as if one ſhould ſay tha
crowne which is in a purſe, is bigge
than the purſe, and that the Earth is bi
ger than heaven that compaſſeth it a
bout.

5 They give to the body of Chriſt
length without extent, that is to ſay,
length without length, ſince all i
length is under one point that hath n
length.

6 They ſay that Chriſts body is
this place, but not locally, as if a ma
ſhould ſay, it is white, but not whitely.
They ſay that the body of the Lord i
preſent, but not corporally, but rathe
ſpiritually. But for a body to be ſpiri
tually preſent, is a thing no leſſe ab
ſur

rd, than for a spirit to be corporal-
present.

7 They will have Christs body in the
rament to be long and large, and yet
hold no space. How is that possible,
ce that length and breadth are spaces.

8 They say that Christs body in the
rament is present not circumscrip-
ely, that is to say, not bounded or en-
osed of any place. Yet what they de-
of the whole, they confesse it of every
verall part of the body. For they can-
ot deny but that in the Lords body the
raines are inclosed, and circumscribed
ithin the scull, and that his heart is en-
osed and limited within the *pericardi-*
, and the lungs within the breast or
heft, since they say that it is a true hu-
ane body.

9 They say that the consecrated hoste
Christ, and that the Priest breakes the
oste, and yet breakes not Christ. They
y that Christs blood is shed in the
asse, and yet budges nor, and comes
ot out of the veines. But all effusion is a
motion: how can then Christs blood be
hed without motion?

10 They say that the Priest drinketh
Christs body and soule under the species
of the wine. By that meanes they make
Christs

Christs body liquid. For although they say that the Priest drinks the Lords body under the *species* of the wine: yet under these *species* it doth not lose its solidity.

11 They say that Christ did eate himselfe, and swallowed up his owne body. Whence it followeth that he had at the same time his mouth in his head, and his head in his mouth, and that the whole was inclosed in one part, whereas parts are comprized in the whole. A man should be esteemed madde that would say that the scabberd is within the blade of the sword, and the purse within the crowne. And all this without being able to tell us what benefit comes to us, that Christ should have eaten himselfe. The absurditie redoubles in that that Christ eating, was infirme and passible, speaking, and moving, and sitting: But Christ that was eaten by Christ, was impassible and without infirmity, neither speaking, nor moving, sitting, lying, nor standing. By this means Christ passible hath devoured the impassible: And Christ did eate himselfe, not such as hee was, but such as he was not.

12 It is true that things contradictory may agree in one and the same subject in severall times, or in severall parts, or in

ſeverall reſpects, that is to ſay, in comparing this thing with ſeverall things*. For example a man may be yong and old ſeverall times: be white in one part of his body, and blacke in the other. Hee may be tall and little, poore and rich ſeverall reſpects, that is to ſay, in comparing him with ſeverall perſons. Hee may be tall in compariſon of a dwarfe, little in compariſon of a Giant, rich in compariſon of a begger, and poore in compariſon of *Seneca*, or *Lucullus*. But here they attribute unto Chriſt contradictory things at one and the ſame time, not in ſeverall parts, and without comparing him with any other but himſelfe. They will have him at one and the ſame time to have beene the *containe* and the *continent*, ſpeaking and moving in the Euchariſt, and neither ſpeaking nor moving in the mouthes of the Apoſtles, having a length without length, an extent without a ſpace.

* *Ariſt. l. 1. Elenchorũ c. 5.* whereas we ſay, *eodẽ reſpectu*, ſaith, πρὸς τὸ αὐτὸ, *ad idem*: and gives for example of divers reſpects, that one and the ſame number may be the double and not the double being cõpared to divers nũbers.

13. They ſay that as God may doe that one and the ſame body be whole and entire in ſeverall remote places, and ſo bee farre and ſeparated from himſelfe, that is to ſay that he be one, and not be one: So likewiſe God can make that two bodies hold but one place, by penetration

penetration of dimensions, as they prattle in their Schooles: That is to say that God can make that a vessell that holds a pinte, without making it bigger or larger, may containe two pintes, yea three, yea tenne, yea a thousand, yea a million, and so *ad infinitum*: So that this pinte shall containe the whole Sea without being made bigger, and without the water of the Sea being any whit diminished. Yea by this doctrine the whole World without diminishing of its bigneſſe, may be enclosed in one grain of wheate.

14. Philosophy by a thousand reasons proveth that it is impossible that there be any *Vacuum* in the World, and our Adversaries teach it so in their Schooles, and with good reason. By *Vacuum* is understood a space of place which is not filled with any substance: a place that is full of nothing. Yet notwithstanding, the *Roman* Church, by Transubstantiation puts a *Vacuum* in the consecrated cup. They say that this chalice is full, but they cannot tell with what body it is filled up. It is not full of wine: For they holde it is no more wine. It is not full of the body of Christ: for they hold that Christs

body

body in the Eucharist filleth no place. As for the accidents they are not a body. So no bodily substance shall be found that filleth the chalice.

15. It is not to be imagined but that when Christ did breake the bread to his Disciples, some crummes thereof fell upon the table: and some residue of that sacred bread was left behind. Now according to the Church of *Romes* doctrine, in every one of these peeces of bread, Christs body was whole and entire. Whereupon wee aske if when Christ (after hee was risen from the table,) swate drops of blood, that body of the Lord which was under these crummes, swate also drops of blood? *Item* if when Christ was put upon the Crosse, that body which was under these crums, or under the residues of that sacred bread was likewise crucified under the species of the bread? For if it was not crucified under these species of the bread, behold there was 2 Christs, the one crucified, the other not crucified. Or if under those species Christs body was crucified, they must also put under the same species the Crosse, and the Souldiers that crucified him. For to be crucified without a crosse is a thing unconceivable, & a plain contradiction.

16. This

16. This body also which was under the reſidue of the conſecrated bread, must of neceſſity either bee living or dead when the Lords body was in the Sepulcher: If living, behold there was two bodies of Chriſt at one and the same time, whereof the one was dead, the other living. Or if that body which was in theſe crummes, ſuffered death under thoſe ſpecies, there was a body of Chriſt which ſuffered death without being put to the croſſe, and without the Souldiers touched it.

17. That if whilſt the body of the Lord was dead, any of his Diſciples had celebrated the Euchariſt, if he had offered a living body, it would not have beene the ſame body that was in the Sepulcher. Or if by pronoũcing the words of conſecration he had turned the bread into a dead body, he had not offered a Sacrifice: For a dead body is not an acceptable Sacrifice. Theſe difficulties would deſerve wel to conſult the Papal Oracle: or ſome deciſion of the *Sorbon.*

18. From the ſame Doctrine followeth, that when in the Proceſſion on *Corpus Chriſti* day two conſecrated hoſtes meet one another and paſſe by one another, Chriſt incounters himſelfe, and goes

goes to meet with his owne selfe. And it is to bee presumed that these *Hostes* know one another, and make one to another a mutuall salutation, and that if one should come to fall, the other that is not fallen, would looke upon that which is fallen, with great compassion.

19. This is one of the best of all, and wherein the Romish Doctors entangle themselves most and trouble their braines exceedingly. A time was that they disputed in the Church of *Rome* whether it be in Gods power to make that one body be circumscriptively in two or in many severall places. As for example, whether God can make that *Philip* be at *Paris* and at *Rome* at one and the same time, contained and limited by two severall remote places. But now they hold with a generall consent that it is possible. Among those that have written in these our times, I know none but *Vasquez* that is of another opinion. This thing admitted to be so, it will follow that if *Philip* be at *Rome* in the water, and in the fire at *Paris*, he shall be both wet and burned at once. If one of his armes be cut off at *Paris*, he shall have but one arme at *Paris*, but

at *Rome* he ſhall have two. If hee be kil'd at *Paris*, he ſhall be dead at *Paris*, and living at *Rome*: and perhaps comming from *Rome* to *Paris*, hee ſhall find himſelfe to be dead, not knowing of it before, and ſhall aſſiſt at his owne funerals. Perhaps that *Philip* of *Paris* will come to *Rome* to ſee himſelfe, and being arrived there, ſhall not find himſelfe there becauſe he abſented himſelfe from *Rome*. That if both of them ſet forth on the way for to meet one another, one and the ſame man ſhall goe to meet himſelfe. And having met with himſelfe, how ſhall their noſes jumble themſelves into one? How ſhall a man turne his back to his owne ſelfe? That if *Philip* doth feaſt at *Paris* and faſt at *Rome*, one and the ſelfe ſame man ſhall be both full and empty, fat and leane at the ſame time. That if *Philip* meete with himſelfe upon the way, and that *Philip* embrace *Philip*, it is evident they ſhall be two. For every conjunction is at leaſt betweene two divers things.

20. That if the body of one and the ſame man may be in a thouſand ſeverall places at one and the ſame time, it may be alſo in a hundred thouſand places, and

and if in a hundred thousand, so likewise in a Million, and so still in augmenting: so that at last one mans body shall be able to fill up the whole world. Indeed, the plurality of places and the *Vbiquity* comes all to one. The difference between the Church of *Rome* and those that put Christs body everywhere, is onely in this: the one say this body is everywhere, and the other say it may be everywhere. Truely the *Roman* Church hath no reason to contend with the *Vbiquitaries* about a thing which she believes to be possible.

21. The point in Mathematicks is no quantity, and hath no magnitude, and is indivisible: To put therefore one and the same point in two divers remote places, is to divide the point and to separate it from it selfe. That is the thing our Adversaries doe, putting one body in two severall places. For example, if *Philip* may be at *Paris* and at *Rome* at one and the same time, the point that is in the midst of the apple of his eye, is the same point aswell at *Rome* as at *Paris*, and yet it is farre from it selfe, and separated and divided from it selfe.

22. And since Angelicall Spirits are

but in one onely place definitively, those that put the Lords body in severall places at once, make it more spirituall than the very Spirits themselves, and divide it from it selfe.

23. There is impietie mingled with that. For after the Priest hath eaten the hoste, they hold that Christs body is in the Priests stomack untill the species by disgestion be destroyed. After then that those species be destroyed, the Lords body is no more there, and yet is not gone out of it: (for these Doctors say it cannot move it selfe locally.) Whereupon it must follow of necessity that this body of Christ which was in the Priests stomack, is turned into nothing. And our Adversaries cannot tell us whither he is gone, nor what is become of him.

## CHAP. XIX.

## CHAP. XIX.

### *Of accidents without a subject: places of Fathers.*

THe accidents without a subject which they put in the consecrated Hoste, are another swarme of ridiculous absurdities and meere contradictions. For what is there more incompatible than this,* to wit, that *Accidentia non accidunt*, as if one said, *Albentia non albent*, that the speakers speake not: and to forge qualities which qualifie nothing: colour and nothing coloured, a length and nothing long, a roundnesse and nothing round: as if one should forge a sight without an eye, a sicknesse without a sicke body, a halting without a legge, an Ecclipse of the Moone without a Moone. So they put in the Hoste a taste of bread, a colour of bread, a roundnesse of bread without bread. And as Pope *Innocent* the third saith in his 4 Booke of the Mysteries of the Masse, chap. 11.† *There is here colour and savour, quantitie and qualitie, though there be here nothing*

* Arist. l. 6. Metaph. cap. 1. *Loquens de accidentibus.* Οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐστιν ὅτι κατ' αὐτὸ πεφυκὸς, ὅτι χωρίζεσθαι πεφυκὸς τῆς οὐσίας.

† *Est enim hic color & sapor, cum nihil alterutro sit coloratum, aut sapidũ, quantum aut quale.*

*nothing ſavory, nothing coloured, nothing that hath quantitie or qualitie.* In ſumme, God hath ſo created ſubſtances, and accidents, that as a created ſubſtance cannot be without accidents, ſo accidents cannot be without a ſubſtance: Theſe things be ſo relative one to another, as to ſeparate them, is as if one ſhould put a Father without a Sonne, or a Sonne without a Father.

This error caſts our Adverſaries headlong into many others. For if the Hoſte become dirtie, being fallen into the mire, loe there are accidents that carry a ſubſtance: and whereas the ſubſtance is the ſubject of accidents, here on the contrarie, accidents are the ſubject of the ſubſtance.

None can deny but that Ice is a ſubſtance; when then the conſecrated cup freezeth, they will have the accidents alone to be frozen, and ſo the accidents are become a Subſtance, by a new kind of Tranſubſtantiation, no leſſe prodigious than the firſt, and which nevertheleſſe availeth nothing to our ſalvation. Vnleſſe they will have Chriſts body to be frozen.

That if the Hoſtes grow mouldie, behold there are lines, a whiteneſſe, a length

length, a roundnesse mouldie. If one warme the consecrated cup so that it smoake, behold accidents which produce a Substance. If (as * *Thomas* and † *Suarez* acknowledge) wormes breed in the consecrated hoste, we must say that accidents have engendred a substance, and that Soul-lesse accidents have produced an animated Substance: and all that without being able to tell what profit the faithfull reape thereby.

The histories written by our adversaries testifie, that Pope a *Victorinus* the 3 was impoysoned in the chalice of the Masse. And that *Henry* the 7 Emperour was served just so in taking the Hoste. b *Matthew Paris*, in the yeare 1154. relates the like of *Henry* Archbishop of *Yorke*. Then it was said with horrour, *God is impoysoned*. It is likely that for to avoid this inconvenience, they make the essay to the Pope, and taste it before him at the Masse, as they doe at his ordinary meales. That if the accidents onely are impoysoned, besides the absurdity

* Thom. 3. part. q. 77. art. 3. *Sensu deprehenditur hostias consecratas putrescere & corrumpi.* Et art. 5. *Ex speciebus sacramentalib. generantur vermes, si corrodantur.*

† Suarez in 3 Thomæ disput. 57. s. 3. *Constat ex hostiis consecratis vermes generari.*

a Platina in Victore 3. & Clemēt. 5. Nauclerus. Gener. temporum. 4. Aventinus lib. 7. pag. 598. Stella, Fasciculus temporum.

b Henricus Archiepiscopus Eboracensis, *cum divina celebraret mysteria, hausto in ipso calice, ut aiunt, venenosa obiit.*

of impoysoning a length, breadth, and colour, where there is nothing long, nothing broad, nor nothing coloured, this ignominy is done to Christ Jesus, that by his presence hee could not remove away the poyson: and that his body served of a vehicle to the poyson, and that being given for the salvation of the soule, it serveth to bring death and destruction to the body.

The Fathers impugne this errour plainly and expresly. [a] *Gregory* of *Nyssa*, in his worke of six dayes. *The figure is not without bodie.* [b] *S. Austin* in his 57 Epistle to *Dardanus*, *Take away the bodies from the qualities of bodies, they shall be no more, and therefore it is necessary they be not.* And a little after, *If the masse of the body be wholy taken away, its qualities shall be no more.* The same in his 2 booke of *Soliloquies*: [c] *Who can yeeld to that thou hast demanded of me, that that which is in the subject, may remaine after the subject is abolished?*

Briefly, in all the Fathers you shal not finde one that saith that in the Eucharist the accidents remaine without a Subject. That if they had beleeved it, doubtlesse when they said that an accident is never without a subject, they would have

[a] Nyss. exam. emero. pag. 13. Τὸ σῆμα οὐκ ἀνευσώματος.

[b] *Tolle ipsa corpora qualitatibus corporum, non erit ubi sint: ideo necesse est ut non sint.* Et paulo post. *Si moles ipsa corporis penitus auferatur, qualitates ejus non erit ubi sint.*

[c] *Illud vero quod interrogasti quis concesserit, ut quod in subjecto est maneat ipso intereunte subjecto?*

have brought this exception taken from the Sacrament.

Moreover S. Austin in his 3 booke of the Trinitie, chap. 10. saith openly that in the Eucharist there is no miracle wrought. *The bread* (saith he) *made for this use, is eaten when the Sacrament is received: but because these things are knowne unto men, by reason they are made by men, they may well be honoured as religious: but cannot be admired as miraculous.* In the 3 Tome of this good Doctor there are 3 bookes *Of the marvelous things of the Scriptures*, wherein he speakes nothing of Transubstantiation, nor of the Eucharist.

[a] *Hæc honorem habere possunt ut religiosa, stuporem autem habere ut mira non possunt.*

And those that talke here of Miracle, understand not what a miracle is. A Miracle is a sensible and a visible effect of the power of God, against or above the course of nature, to the end he may make his vertue knowne unto men. But in the Masse there is nothing seene miraculous. None can boast without lying, that ever he saw the Transubstantiation made. We do not deny but God may do all these things, if he would. But we say it is impossible that he would have such things to come to passe. For he will be no lyar, nor will contradict himselfe, nor tie

tie and submit his omnipotencie to mens imagination, who imploy it in ridiculous things, and forging of Chymeras and castles in the aire.

## CHAP. XX.

*Answers to some examples brought out of the Scriptures, by our adversaries for to prove that the body of Christ hath beene sometimes in two severall places.*

TO cloake this abuse, they say that as God hath made that sometimes two bodies have filled and occupied but one place, so hee can make that one and the same body be in severall places at once: and thereupon they alleage for example that Christ entred in at the doores shut, *John* 20. 19. and consequently did penetrate the wood of the doores. But they falsifie the Scripture. S. *John* saith not that Christ entred in at the doores shut, but that hee entred in when *the doores were shut*. It may be that he went in by some other place than by the doore,

Θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων.

doore. It may be that the wood of the doore, or the stones of the wall yeelded into him, the creature yeelding and obeying the Creator, as [a] *Hierome* saith, *and went in at the doore shut, the creature having yeelded to the Creator*. By saying that he entred in at the doore shut, hee meant the doore yeelded to him, or that hee opened it at his coming in. So if I say, a muddie brooke runnes thorow a cleare water, I meane it marred it as it went thorow. But the best is alwayes to sticke close to the holy Scriptures.

[a] Hieron. ad Pammach. adv. Joh. Ierosol. *Deum transiresper clausam portam, & creaturam cedere creatori.*

Againe, they alleage to the same purpose, that Christs body coming out of the Sepulcher, passed thorow the stone that stopped the mouth of the Sepulcher, without taking away or removing the stone. *Matth.* 28. 2. But this place is likewise alleaged falsly: For Saint *Matthew* in the very same place saith the cleane contrary. *There was* (saith he) *a great Earthquake: For the Angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came, and* [b] *rolled back the stone from the doore of the Sepulcher*. And *Marke*, chap. 16. 4. saith the same. [c] *Leo* the first Bishop of *Rome*, in his 95 Epistle to *Leo Augustus*, acknowledges it, saying that *in the third day the flesh of the Lord arose againe, the*

[b] ἀπεκύλισε τὸν λίθον.

[c] Thom. 1. Concil. Edition. Colon. an. 1567. pag. 814. Revoluto monimenti lapide, tertio die caro resurrexit.

*the ſtone of the monument being rolled backe.*

In vaine do they alleage that Chriſt walked upon the waters. For what is that to prove that his body may be in ſeverall places at one and the ſame time? He that walketh upon the waters, is not for that farre from himſelfe. If Chriſt by his divine power, hath made the waters firme under his feete, or ſuſtained his body that it might not ſinke, he hath not for that placed his body in ſeverall places, nor changed the nature of his body. If I keepe up and uphold with my hand a ſtone above the water, that changes not the nature of the ſtone, and doth not take from it its weight and heavineſſe.

For to prove that the body of the Lord hath beene ſometimes in two ſeverall places at once, they alleage the 23 chapter of the Actes, verſe 11. where it is ſaid, *That the night following, the Lord ſtoode by Paul*: from whence they doe inferre that Chriſts body being in heaven, ſtood nevertheleſſe by Saint *Paul* on earth. In ſpeaking thus, they preſuppoſe without proofe that the Lord of whom is ſpoken in this place, is Chriſt onely, and not God ſimply without diſtinction

inction of perſons. Yea even in retaining this word, LORD, to Chriſts perſon, there is nothing in that place that obliges us to underſtand this of the body of Chriſt, rather then of his divine nature and vertue. Might not the ſonne of God ſpeake and make himſelfe ſenſible to Saint *Paul* by his divine vertue, without a locall and bodily approach? The *Greeke* word ἐπιστὰς, whereof Saint *Luke* makes uſe, ſignifieth not onely to ſtand by one, but alſo to come upon him unlook'd for, to relieve and ſuccour him, and make him feele his favour, as may be ſeene *Acts* 12. 7. *Luke* 2. 9. *Acts* 23. 27. In all theſe places the *Greeke* word ſignifieth to come upon unlooked for. Now the *Roman* Church doth not beleeve that Chriſt comes unto the Sacrament, but beleeves that hee is made in it.

*Act.* 12. 7. & Luc. 2. 9. ἄγγελος ἐπέστη. Act. 23. 27. ἐπιστὰς σὺν τῷ στρατεύματι.

## CHAP. XXI.

## CHAP. XXI.

*Of the dignitie of Priests. And how our Adversaries debase and vilifie the utilitie and efficacie of Masses, and make them unprofitable for the remission of sinnes. And of the traffick of Masses.*

THe Doctors of the *Roman* Church do speake of the Eucharist as of the highest mystery of Christian Religion, and extoll with such bigge termes the power of priests in making Christ with a few words, that they call them Gods and Creators of their Creator, having a power above the blessed Virgin *Mary*, and above all the Angels, who cannot make Christ, because he is made already. So saith *Gabriel Biel* in his 4 lesson upon the Canon of the Masse. * *The Angels, Citizens of Heaven, dare not aspire to the authority of Priesthood.* And a little after: † *Passing by the bands of Angels, let us come to the Queene of Heaven and Lady of*

* *Ad Sacerdotii authoritatem Angeli cœlorum cives nõ audent aspirare.*

† *Transgrediendo perinde agmina Angelorum, ad ipsam cœli Reginã, & mundi Dominam veniamus. Hæc etsi in gratiæ plenitudine cæteras supergrediatur, universas, Hierarchas tamen cedit commissi mysterii executione.*

the World. The same, though in plenitude of grace shee goes beyond all the creatures, yet shee yeelds to the Hierarchs of the Church, (he cals the Priests so) in the reception of the Mystery committed unto them. And it is in the same lesson where he saith, that *Christ is incarnate and made flesh in the hands of Priests, as in the Virgins wombe, and that Priests doe create their Creator, and have power over the body of Christ.*

*Peter de Besse* in his Booke of the *Royall Priesthood*, chapter 2. speakes thus, *Saint Peter addeth that all Priests are Kings, in token whereof they weare the crowne.* And in the 3 chapter: *The Priesthood and the Godhead are in some things to be parallell'd, and are almost of equall greatnesse, since they have equall power, Matth. 16. & 18.* Againe, *Seeing that the Priesthood walketh hand in hand with the Godhead, & that Priests are Gods: it goes farre beyond the kingly authority, and Priests are farre above Kings.* And in the same place, hee calls them *Masters of Kings, surpassing as much in dignitie the royall office, as the Soule surpasses the body.* Which hee hath taken out of * *Baronius*. He addes: *Incredible things* (saith he) *but yet true, that the power of Priests*

* *Baron. annal. An. 57. §. 31. At verò longe præstare sacerdotes regibus argumento quo utitur plane significat. Et paulo post,* Regem sacris ministris minorem gerere ordinè certum est. *And shewes it by the example of S. Martin, who made a Priest drinke before the Emperour, at the Emperour his owne table.*

*Priests is so great, and their excellencie so noble, that heaven depends on them.* Item in the same place comparing the Priest with *Josuah*, at whose Prayer the Sunne stood still, he saith: *Josuah stopped but the Sunne, but these (* to wit the Priests) *stay Christ being in heaven, in the midst of an Altar. The creature obeyed to the first, but the Creator obeyes to these last: The Sunne to the one, and God to the other, as often as they pronounce the sacred words.* To be short, he concludes that *whatsoever God is in heaven, the Priest is the same on earth.* And all that with the approbation of the Faculty of Divinity at *Paris*, prefixed in the front of the Booke.

It is good to know that England having beene a long time without a Bishop subject to the Pope, the English Papists complained lately they had no body to conferre them the Orders, and to minister unto them the confirmation, without which the Canons say that a man cannot be wholy a Christian. Vnto whose desire *Vrban* now raigning being willing to satisfie, sent them a titular Bishop which hee hath called *Bishop* of *Calcedon*. But the Jesuits, that are in possession of ruling and governing among

among the English Papists, would not receive that Bishop, saying that Confirmation is not necessary, and that the Baptismall Vnction may supply the want of Episcopall Crisome and that a Church may bee without a Bishop. Against whom the *Sorbonne* of *Paris* did cast some Censures, calling their doctrine hereticall and scandalous. Of which censures these Jesuites made a laughing stock, in a Booke full of bitternesse, which they have titled *Spongia*. For to refute this *Spongia*, the *Sorbonne* made use of the penne of a Sorbonist called *Petrus Aurelius*. In whose Booke printed at *Paris* by *Charles Morell*, I finde these words in the page 175. *The Bishops have the power to produce Christ, that is to say, God himselfe, &c. Which vertue is in a manner infinite, and equivalent not onely to the fecunditie of the Virgin Mother of God, inasmuch as the Virgin-Priests procreate upon the Altar the same God whom the Virgin procreated first in her most holy wombe: But also hath some emulation with the eternall operations by which the divine persons are produced, and with the eternall generation, by which the Father produceth with his divine mouth the same* Word *which the Priests produce with* Anno, 1634.

*their ſacred mouthes.* And gathers from thence, that the power of Prieſts ſurpaſſes very farre all the Angelicall power. And in the page 177. he ſaith that *Prieſts doe perfect and accompliſh the Redemption of mankinde.* And in the page 187. he ſaith that *the power of Prieſts is moſt like unto the Divine power, and that they have power over the reall body of Chriſt, and over his myſticall body* which is the Church: and that with the Approbation of the *Sorbon* ſet in the front of the Booke.

Long before, Pope *Urban* the ſecond, * in the yeare 1097. called a Councell at *Rome* againſt the Emperour *Henry* the fourth, in which he did thunder againſt earthly Princes who challenged to themſelves the inveſtiture of Benefices, alleadging *it is a thing abhominable that the hands of thoſe which create God their Creator by their Character, ſhould be bound to this ignominie to be as drudges or ſervants to the hands that are night and day polluted with filthy and diſhoneſt attractations.* If theſe things be true, reaſon requires that ſo great a power hath not beene given unto Prieſts without great neceſſity, and without ſome great profit ſhould come thereby unto the

* *Simeon Dunelmenſis Lib. 2. Chron.* Vignier in his Eccleſiaſtiall Hiſtory pag. 310.

Chriſtian

Christian Church, and that so many wonders as our Adversaries pile up in the Eucharist, be greatly usefull and profitable to the faithfull. Yet when we come to examine what the fruit is that comes from Transubstantiation and from the Sacrifice of the Masse, we find they reduce it almost to nothing, and make the Masse almost needlesse and unprofitable.

That appeares as cleare as the day, by comparing it with Baptisme. For in Baptisme there is no Transubstantiation made. After these words *I baptise thee in the name of the Father*, &c. the water remaines in its owne nature, and is not turned into blood. Yet notwithstanding, according to the doctrine of the *Roman* Church, Baptisme is a thousand times more profitable and beneficiall, and of a more excellent nature. For in the *Roman* Church they hold Baptisme with water absolutely necessary to Salvation. But as for the Eucharist, our Adversaries hold that many are saved without being partakers thereof: as appeareth by the example of *John the Baptist*, and of the *Theife* crucified with Christ our Lord, and of many faithfull people that dye with-

out having partaked thereof, ſpecially of thoſe which the Ancient Church did call Catechumenes.

Secondly our Adverſaries ſay, that by Baptiſme not onely originall ſinne is pardoned, but even wholly taken away, ſo that thoſe which are Baptiſed, have no more originall ſinne, nor nothing (to ſpeake properly) that may be called ſinne. But concerning the Euchariſt, the *Roman* Church doth not beleeve that it wipes away the vices, nor vicious cuſtomes in ſuch ſort as it may bee ſayd that all thoſe which are made partakers of the Euchariſt, bee without pride, or without covetouſneſſe, or without laſcivious luſts.

* Vaſquez Tomo III. in 3 parte Thomæ Diſp. 179. cap 3. num. 26. *Rudes non debent hunc articulum ſcire, neque virtutem hujus Sacramenti, peculiarem ad remittendum venialia, quia hæc remiſſio non eſt ad ſalutem neceſſaria.*

The principall is, that our Adverſaries teach that by Baptiſme is remitted and aboliſhed all the guilt and puniſhment, both eternall and temporall, of all the ſinnes as well veniall as mortall, committed before Baptiſme. But as for the Euchariſt, they ſay it availeth but againſt veniall ſinnes, which they make to be ſo light, that a man needs not ſo much as to have any contrition or repentance for them. *Vaſquez* the Jeſuite: * *The rude and vulgar ſort ought not to*

know

*know the particular vertue of this Sacrament in remitting veniall sinnes, for that remission is not necessary unto salvation.* And the Catechisme of the Councell of *Trent*, in the chapter of the Sacrament of the Eucharist: * *It must not be doubted but by the Eucharist, light sinnes, which are called veniall, are remitted and forgiven*, which remission *Vasquez* told us just now not to be necessary. *Bellarmin* in the seventeenth Chapter of his fourth Booke of the Eucharist, putteth this among *Luthers* errors, to have said that *the first effect of this Sacrament is the remission of mortall sinnes.* And about the end of the same Chapter: *The whole question is reduced to this article, Whether the Sacrament of the Eucharist doe conferre the forgivenesse of mortall sinnes wherewith a mans conscience is charged, or else (for it comes all to one) if for to receive the Communion worthily, it be required that a mans conscience be not charged with any mortall sinne: For all Catholicks teach that the Eucharist remits not such sinnes wherewith a mans conscience is loaden, and therefore it is requisite they should be purged before.* And in the beginning of the eighteenth Chapter: *In this chapter it is not taught that the Eucharist be instituted*

* Catechis. Trident. *Remitti Eucharistiâ & condonari leviora peccata quæ venialia dici solent, nõ est quod dubitari debeat.*

*ſtituted for the remiſſion of ſinnes, but only for to preſerve ſpirituall life.*

And though even theſe Doctors were not ſo expreſſe upon this ſubject, Yet the practiſe of the *Roman* Church ſhewes evidently that the Euchariſt and the Maſſe availes nothing for the remiſſion of ſinnes. For he that will receive the communion, muſt be confeſſed before, and after confeſſion he receives of the Prieſt the abſolution and forgiveneſſe of all his ſinnes. Whereupon it followeth, that when a little after he receives the hoſte, there is nothing at all to be pardoned: and that the Euchariſt is a plaiſter for a healed wound, and a remedie for a diſeaſe which is not.

Of how ſmall efficacy likewiſe the Sacrifice of the Maſſe is in the *Roman* Church, appeares in that they ſing or ſay tenne thouſand Maſſes for to draw one Soule out of Purgatory, and yet after ſo many Maſſes, they doubte ſtill whether that Soule be in Heaven, and are ſtill uncertaine of its condition.

They Sacrifice in private Maſſes the body of Chriſt in a corner of a Church, for the eaſing of a ſicke body, or for the

the curing of a horse; but it fals out very often that both man and horse dye, and that the Priest hath created his Creator and Sacrificed Christ for naught. Whence ariseth a great occasion of doubting whether Masses serve for drawing of Soules out of Purgatory. For if Masses cannot obtaine so small a thing, what assurance have we they shall obtaine a greater? seeing that no Soule comes out of that Countrey for to thanke those who in causing Masses to be said, have eased it with their money. For these private Masses are payed by such as cause them to be sayd at their intention. The Priest in his *Memento* names none of those for whom nothing was given. Of particular Masses for the Soule of a Beggar, there is no speech of it. Therefore *Gabriel Biel* in his 25 Lesson upon the Canon of the Masse, warnes the Testators * that bequeath any thing to the Church for the easing of their Soules, to chuse faithfull executors, least their Soules be frustrated of the Suffrages of the Church, for lacke of payment. That is to say, that Masses are not said if they be not paid for before hand.

* *Attendere debent hæc testatores, ut non desidibus & torpētibus aut alias minus timoratis executiones suarum studeant committere voluntatum, ut per executionis negligentiā dum non fiunt quæ ordinarunt suffragijs priventur, &c.*

And seeing that our Adversaries hold

with us that our Saviour Christ, sitting at the right hand of God, maketh request for all the faithfull: it follows that he makes request also for the Soules that are in Purgatory. If they come out of that fire through his Intercession, Masses are unprofitable. But if they come not out; who will beleeve that a Masse or a Papall Indulgence can doe that which Christs Intercession hath not done?

This is a Maxime received among the Romish Doctors, that a * Masse said for three or foure persons that joyn and pay for it together, is not so available and profitable unto them, as if every one should cause a Masse to be said for himselfe alone. By this meanes the gaine encreases three or foure fold *Emanuel Sa* the Jesuite, in his Aphorismes, gives this rule full of great equity: †*That if a Priest hath received a summe of money for to say a certaine number of Masses, he may hire other Priests that will say them at a lower rate, and keepe to himselfe the rest of the money.*

And it is marvellous and strange, that Priests, which are thought to have the power to make a God with a few words, and to carry Christ every day shut up in a Pixe or Boxe, and in their stomaks, are

in

* Eman. Sa Aphorism. verbo Missa. *Si missa pro multis offeratur non tantundem singulis prodesset, ac si pro illis solis offerretur. Sylvester, Navarrus, Toletus, Suarez, Scotus.*

† Idem Ibidem. *Cui datur certa pecuniæ summa pro Missis à se dicendis potest alios pro minore pretio conducere qui adjuvent, & reliquum sibi retinere.*

in the meane while in such contempt, and that the Country Priests are the reproach and the very dregs of the people: And that a Cardinall Deacon, who hath no power to make Christ, should equall in magnificence the Kings of the Earth, whilst a wretched Priest is tipling in an Alehouse, and of his singing of Masses makes his onely living. Who when he maketh Christ in a private Masse for two or three groats, may justly say with *Judas, What will you give me and I will deliver him unto you?* Men boast to give or deliver God unto others, and cannot give Salvation. And our Adversaries confesse, that there are some Priests damned: Whereupon it will follow, that a man which hath carried God so many times, is himselfe carryed away by the Devill.

## CHAP XXII.

## CHAP. XXII.

### *That the* Roman *Religion is a new Religion, and forged for the Popes profit and of the Clergie.*

AFter that our Adversaries have utterly changed and wholly disfigured the Christian Religion, it becomes them very ill to accuse us of noveltie. For indeed the *Roman* Religion is a garment patched with new peeces, and a heap or pile of doctrines invented and added from age to age, beaten upon the anvile of Ambition and covetousnesse. We are ready to undergoe all kinds of punishments, if in the five hundred years after Christ, (and we might descend lower) one man be found, that had and professed a Religion comming any thing neere to the *Roman* Religion as it is at this day. Can they finde one Church in all the Antiquity, wherein the * people was deprived of the communion of the Cup? Hath the Ancient Church forbidden unto the people the reading of the holy Scriptures? Did she

* Concilij Constā. sess. XIII. Quod in primitiva Ecclesia hujusmodi Sacramentum reciperetur à fidelibus sub utraque specie.

he beleeve the fire of Purgatory? Was there then any speech of *Romish* *Indulgences, and of the Treasure of the Church, in which the Pope gathers up the Superabundance of Satisfactions and penall workes of Saints and Monks, and distributes them to others by his Indulgences? Did they make in those dayes any Images of God and of the Trinity, in stone or in painting? Did men worship the Images of Saints? Was there then any Penitents that whipt themselves in publick, not onely for their owne sinnes, but also to satisfie for the sinnes of other men? Did the Bishops of *Asia*, *Ægypt*, *Africk*, &c. sweare allegiance to the Bishop of *Rome*, or did they take from him their Letters of Investure?

Was the publick Service read in an unknowne tongue to the people? Did the Bishop of *Rome* then call himself a God? Did hee cause himself to bee worshipped? Did he give Pardons of two or three hundred thousand yeares? Did he depose Kings, and brag of his power to give and take away their Kingdomes? Had he power to dispense of Oathes and Vowes? And to disjoyne Marriages lawfully contracted, under colour

* Gabriel Biel, lect. 57 in can. Missæ: Dicendum quod ante tempora beati Greg. modicus vel nullus fuit usus indulgentiarum. Vid. Caiet. tract. de Indulgent. cap. 2. & Navarrum Tom. 3. Comment. de Jubil. & Indulg. septimo Notabili, Art. 5. & 6.

colour of Monachall profession? Did they then speake of Beades, Rosaries, blessed Graines, Agnus Dei? &c. The like I say of the title they give to the Virgin *Mary*, of Queene of Heaven and Lady of the World: and of the severall Offices they give unto Saints, to the one the charge over such a Countrey, to the other over such a Disease, to another over such and such a trade. As also the power that Priests take upon them to give the absolution, and forgive sinnes in the quality of Judges, is a new thing, and of the dregges of the latter ages. *Item* Privat Masses without Communicants and without assistants, said at the Intention of those that pay for them, are a thing whereof no trace is to be found in all Antiquitie. As also the taxe of the Papall Chauncerie, wherein the Absolutions for * Murther, for Parricide, Incest, Perjury, are taxed at a certaine rate of money. So many groats, or so many Ducats for a man that hath killed his Father: so much for him that hath lyen with his Mother. A *Roman* Jesuit called *Silvester Petra sancta* wrote lately a Booke against me, wherein he teaches us a thing which we knew not

* *Cap. de absolut. ibus. Absolutio pro eo qui interfecit patrem, matrem, gros. 7 Absolutio pro eo qui falsificavit literas Apostolicas, grossos 15.*

ot before. He saith in the thirteenth Chapter, that during the time of Advent and Lent, the Pope permits not a man in *Rome* to passe the whole night in a bawdy house: that would be thought violating of the holynesse of Lent. Wherefore in those dayes of devotion, it is onely permitted to passe the whole day and a part of the night in the Bawdy-house. Can such Lawes be found in the Ancient Church? Briefly, it is a very new Religion, and a heape of doctrines and Lawes unheard off in all Antiquitie, expressly invented for gain, and for the raising of the Popes Empire, and building up that Monarchie which was not in the first ages of the Church: And for to keepe the People in ignorance, least they should discover these Mysteries.

For example, Indulgences, Private Masses, Masses and Suffrages for the dead, are very lucrative and profitable to the Pope and the Clergie. By Auricular Confessions, Priests know the secrets of Families, and keepe the Consciences of men in awe and subjection. And the Absolution of sinnes is not given for nothing. The Workes and satisfactions supererogatorie of

Monks,

colour of Monachall profession? Do they then speake of Beades, Rosaries, blessed Graines, Agnus Dei? &c. The like I say of the title they give to the Virgin *Mary*, of Queene of Heaven and Lady of the World: and of the severall Offices they give unto Saints, to the one the charge over such a Countrey, to the other over such a Disease, to another over such and such a trade. As also the power that Priests take upon them to give the absolution, and forgive sinnes in the quality of Judges, is a new thing, and of the dregges of the latter ages. *Item* Privat Masses without Communicants and without assistants, said at the Intention of those that pay for them, are a thing whereof no trace is to be found in all Antiquitie. As also the taxe of the Papall Chauncerie, wherein the Absolutions for * Murther, for Parricide, Incest, Perjury, are taxed at a certaine rate of money. So many groats, or so many Ducats for a man that hath killed his Father: so much for him that hath lyen with his Mother. A *Roman* Jesuit called *Silvester Petra sancta* wrote lately a Booke against me, wherein he teaches us a thing which we knew not

* *Cap. de absolutionibus. Absolutio pro eo qui interfecit patrem, matrem, gros. 7 Absolutio pro eo qui falsificavit litteras Apostolicas, grossos 15.*

ot before. He saith in the thirteenth hapter, that during the time of Adent and Lent, the Pope permits not a an in *Rome* to passe the whole night in bawdy house: that would be thought violating of the holynesse of Lent. Wherefore in those dayes of devotion, is onely permitted to passe the whole ay and a part of the night in the Bawy-house. Can such Lawes be found in he Ancient Church? Briefly, it is a ery new Religion, and a heape of octrines and Lawes unheard off in all Antiquitie, expressly invented for gain, nd for the raising of the Popes Empire, and buildi ng up that Monarchie which was not in the first ages of the Church: And for to keepe the People in ignorance, least they should discover these Mysteries.

For example, Indulgences, Private Masses, Masses and Suffrages for the dead, are very lucrative and profitable to the Pope and the Clergie. By Auricular Confessions, Priests know the secrets of Families, and keepe the Consciences of men in awe and subjection. And the Absolution of sinnes is not given for nothing. The Workes and satisfactions supererogatorie of

Monks,

Monkes, ſerve to fill up that Spirituall Treaſure of the Pope, whereof he carries the keyes, diſtributing theſe ſatisfactions to the people by his Indulgences, ſo lucrative and profitable to the Pope and his Clergie. By Abſolution the Prieſts make themſelves Judges of Soules, and Judges in Gods cauſe. By reſerving to themſelves and unto Kings the communion of the Cup, they make themſelves companions unto Kings, and exalt themſelves above the People. By the ſingle life of Biſhops, and other Clergie men, the Pope keepes the Eccleſiaſticall goods from being waſted and conſumed, and from being diverted and turned to the reliefe and enriching of the Children. In painting God the Father dreſſed like a Pope, they plant this opinion in the minde of the People, that the Pope is like unto God, and that God makes great account of the Pope, ſince he borrowes his habit. By Canonizing of Saints, the Pope makes the People to worſhip his groomes, and gives the title of Saint for a recompence of Services. By the Sacrament of Penance, the Pope and his Prieſts uſurpe the power of impoſing corporall and pecuniary puniſhments,

ents, * so farre as to cause Kings to e whipt. By the Service in the Latin ongue hee entertaines the People in norance, and giving them his tongue, lanteth in the midst of them a marke his Empire. He gives them the *Ro-* Language for to tame and inure em to the *Roman* Religion. The Popes ower to unthrone Kings, makes him King of Kings, and exalts him on an Empire above all the Greatnesse that s in the World. Images, which are alled ignorant mens Books, accustome he People to forget, and be without he Scriptures, which in those Countries where the inquisition raignes, is a Booke altogether unknowne among the People. By Transubstantiation, Priests make Christ, and have him in their owne power. By Holy-dayes that the Pope ordaines, he rules the Civill Government, causing the Shops to be shut up, and the Seates of Justice and of the Kings Counsell to cease. When the Merchants shop shutteth, the Clergie-mens shop openeth. For then doe the People goe to gaine Pardons (as they tearme it) and visit Reliques, and alwayes the Bason is by. By the distinction of meates and fasting dayes,

* *Thus caused he Henry the second of England to be whipt by a troope of Monkes. As is to be seene in Matth. Paris, and in Westmonasteriensis*

the

the Pope rules the Markets, and bellies, and Kitchins, and Kings and Peoples tables. And the more prohibitions there is, the oftner come they to the Pope and to the Prelates for to have dispensations. The Pope hath made of Matrimonie a Sacrament, that he might take away from the civill Magistrates and Judges Secular the right of judging of such causes; for it belongs to the Church to judge of Sacraments.

By Dispensations in degrees of consanguinity which in the Word of God hinders the Marriage, the Pope maketh that the Children of Princes (for such dispensations are given but to Great ones) are obliged to defend the Popes Authority, if they will be held for legitimate. By Annates or first fruites of Benefices, and the sale of Archiepiscopall Cloakes, the Pope makes an incredible gaine. And there is such a Cloake, for which he drawes above threescore thousand Ducats. By the power which the Pope assumes to himselfe to change the Commandements of God, and to dispense of Vowes and Oathes made unto God, he exalts himselfe above God. For hee that can free and exempt men from obeying God and being faithfull

faithfull to him, must be greater than God.

The Invocation of Saints, the Adoration of Reliques, and the Miracles which are said to be wrought at those Reliques, serve to build up many Churches & Monasteries, which are as so many props to the Papall Domination. In sum, all the subtilty and policy in the World hath been brought therein. Never was there any Empire built with so much craft and cunning. The doctrine which teacheth that Christ Jesus by his death hath delivered us from the guilt and punishment of sinnes before Baptisme: but as for the sinnes committed after Baptisme, that we must beare the punishment for them, either in this life, or in Purgatory: hath clipped Christs benefice for to make place unto their traffick, and for to give credit to their Indulgences, and Masses for the dead. In a word, they make profit of all: Death it selfe is tributary to the *Roman* Clergie.

CHAP. XXIII.

## CHAP. XXIII.

### *Answer to the Question made unto us by our Adversaries, Where was your Religion before* Calvin.

THis demand which every foot is made unto us by our Adversaries, viz. *Shew us where your Religion was before Calvin*, is altogether unjust and deceitfull. For to keepe us from examining the *Roman* Religion by the holy Scripture, they amuse us with humane Histories. For this is not a question of Divinity, but of History, wherein God hath not commanded us to be learned and skilfull that wee may bee saved: But hath commanded us to be instructed in his Word. At the day of judgement, God shall not aske us whether we have beleeved as they did beleeve before *Calvin*: but Saint *Paul* tels us that God shall judge us according to his Gospell, and that men shall be judged by the Law of God, *Rom.* 2. 12. & 16.

That

That if for to be saved it were necessary to know the History of the ages before *Calvin*, mounting upwards from *Calvin* to the Apostles time, hardlie one Christian of a thousand could be saved.

That if the question be touching Histories, it is certaine we must begin by the Antientest, and that it belongs to our Adversaries to shew where their Religion was in the time of the Apostles, afore they speake of the time before *Calvin*. There they are at a stand and driven to a non-plus, and not being able to shew their Religion in the Apostles writings, they send us back to an unwritten word, which depends on the Popes Authority, whom they make judge in his owne cause, and make the Church of *Rome* the Soveraigne Judge of her owne proper duty.

The principall is, that the Christian Church is subject to the Lawes and to the practice of the Church of the Apostles time, and not to the example of what was done before *Calvin*. Of whom they speake as of the Inventor of our Religion, because he exhorted us to beleeve the holy Scriptures. For *Calvin* gave us not any Lawes. We speake

not of him in our Sermons, we ground not our selves upon his authority, we doe not say of him what the Church of *Rome* saith of the Pope, to wit that he could not erre. We doe not call our selves Calvinists, as our Adversaries acknowledge themselves to be Papists, and make glory of that title, as * Cardinall *Baronius* doth, in his Martyrologie at the 16 of *October*, where he saith that *a man cannot be adorned with a higher degree of glory than to bee called a Papist.* So that after his account the title of Papist is of as much worth as the name of a Christian.

**certe nullo sublimiori gloriæ titulo exornare, nec certius, eos esse Catholicos, demonstrare potuissent, quàm eos nuncupare Romanos atq; Papistas.*

This demand is so much the more absurd, as it is made unto us. For when they aske of us where our Religion was before *Calvin*, they presuppose that the Orthodoxe Church ought to be visible in all ages: Which the Scripture saith not, but foretels us of great revolts and false Doctors that shall teach men to abstaine from Marriage and from meates which God hath created for to be received with thanksgiving, 1. *Timoth.* 4. 3. It foretels us that all the Earth ravished in admiration, shall goe after the Beast, *Revel.* 13, 3. and that when Christ shall come, hardly

hardly shall he find faith on the earth, *Luke* 18. 8. It tells us of the Sonne of perdition that shall bee called God, and shall doe wonders: and of the great harlot cloathed with scarlet, who sitteth in the Citty with seaven hills, that raigneth over the Kings of the earth, which seduceth Kings and makes them drunke, and is made drunke with the blood of the Saints and Faithfull. It tells us in the twelfth of the *Revelation* that wings are given to the Church for to flie into the Wilderneſſe, and live there hidden for a time. It warnes us that the broad way where the throng of Peoples passeth, leadeth into perdition. 2. Thes. 2. Revel. 17.

Which things afford us another consideration. That is if a Cut-purse asketh him whom hee hath robbed of his purse, *Where is thy Purse?* This theefe addeth scoffing and derision to his theft. So the Pope, who since so many ages hath persecuted to the uttermost the Church of God, and endeavoured to abolish it, addeth to this violence this derision and scoffing, when he asketh, *Where was your Religion at that time?* For it were rather his part to informe us where hee had put

her himselfe, and to what passe he hath reduced her.

In the meane while, though we are not bound to answer to such an absurd and injust a demand, and which doth not at all concerne Religion, and being propounded by men whose Religion is new, and that have swerved from the Ancient Christian Religion, and who even say, that the Pope may add unto the Creed new Articles of Faith: Yet we say that it is foure or five hundred years agoe since the Pope persecuteth with fire and sword the Faithfull ones, whereof there was a great number in *France*, in the *Low countries*, *England*, *Germany*, *Bohemia*, and *Hungaria*, to whom our Adversaries gave odious nicknames, calling them *Valdenses*, *Albigenses*, *Sodomites*, *Picards*, &c. And fathering upon them many impious and abhominable doctrines farre from their beleife. Of whom were Massacred in few months by one *Dominick*, Author of the Order of the *Jacobins*, above two hundred thousand in *Languedoc* and *Gascoine*, in Pope *Innocent* the third his time. Of these faithfull people we have the Confession agreeable to ours, written in their owne Language: a residue of which

People

People remaines still in *Bohemia*, *Hungaria*, *Moravia*, and in the Valleys of *Angrogne*, *Luzerne*, *Peruse*, *Saint Martin*, *Pragela*, *Merindoles*, and *Cabrieres*, which Churches have joyned themselves to ours, so soone as it pleased God to display in *France* and the neighbouring Countries, the Banner of his Gospell. And the sudden alteration that hapned in *Luthers* time, shewed that *Europe* was full of People that knew the truth, and groaned after a Reformation, which the Pope promised alwayes, but would never suffer it to come to execution.

And for to specifie some thing touching the age immediatly before *Calvin*: *Æneas Sylvius*, who in the yeare 1458. attained to the Popedome, was a capital enemie to the faithfull (of whom in his time *Bohemia* and *Hungaria*, and the neighbouring Countries were full) and was a firebrand of warre for to provoke the Emperours and Popes to persecute them. Wherefore his testimony in this point is the more worthy of credit. This man in his 130 Epistle, describeth his journey to *Tabor*, a City in *Bohemia*, and the Religion of the Inhabitants, and the Conferences he had with them. *Their sect* (saith he) *is pestilen-*

*tions and abhominable, and worthy of the uttermost punishment. They will not admit the Church of* Rome *to have the Primacy, nor that the Clergie should have any thing in propriety. They pull down the Images of God and of his Saints. They deny Purgatory. They hold that the Prayers of Saints which raigne with Christ, availe nothing unto men. They observe no holy day but the Lords day and Easter. Contemne fasting and the Canonicall Prayers. They give the Eucharist under the kindes of bread and wine, even to little Children and to madde men.* When they consecrate the Sacrament, they say nothing but the Lords Prayer, and the words of Consecration. They change no habits and take not any ornaments. Yea some of them are so madde as to hold that the very body of Christ is not in the Sacrament of the Alter, but that it is onely the representation thereof: being wandring Sectators of *Berengarius* unconverted. Among the Sacraments of the Church they admit the Baptisme, and the Eucharist, and Marriage, and Orders. *But as for the Sacrament of Penance, they make little account of it. But of Confirmation and extreame Unction, they make no reckoning at*

all.

. They are very opposite to the Religious
Monkes, and affirme they be diabolicall
nventions. They use meere Water in Bap-
sme. They have no holy Water. They
e not consecrate their Church-yards. They
ry their dead in the fields and with
easts, as also they deserve it, &c. And
e addeth that the Emperour, in stead
f destroying them, granted unto them
afety and liberty. But he should have ad-
ded to this, that the Emperor *Sigismond*
having by armes assaulted and scuffled
with them, lost there many Battles. For
which cause he did let them rest in peace.
In this discourse *Æneas* hath chopt and
thrust in some calumniations, as when he
saith they give the Eucharist to madde
men and to Infants, and bury their
dead with beasts. Things very absurde,
and that never were. As for the rest, all
our Religion almost is seene in it.

*Hungaria* at the same time was full
of Faithfull people holding the same
beleife. They presented to the King *Vla-
dislaus*, in the yeare of our Lord 1508.
their Confession of faith, conformable
to ours, defending themselves against an
Austin Frier that had accused them to
the King of many errors, namely,
for that they did not obey the Pope,

called

called not upon Saints, denied Purgatory, received the Communion in both kinds, and rejected Transubstantiation. Vpon which last point, they speak thus:

This Confession is to be found *in Fasciculo rerum expetendarum.*

*This Frier writeth that the bread and wine in their natural substance are changed into the body and blood of Christ, and are changed into Christ God and man, so that nothing of the substance of the bread and wine remaineth, but that the onely accidents are meerely upheld by miracle. This Confession of faith hath no foundation in the Lord Christ Jesus his words, who never spake one word of the conversion of the substance.* And a little after, *By that is manifested that the Primitive Church had this Beleife, and hath confessed it, and hath not erred, and did not bowe at this Sacrament. For in that time they received the Sacrament sitting, and reserved nothing of it, and carried none of it out of the house, &c.*

About the same time, in the yeare 1520. *Calvin* being yet very young, the Faithfull of *Provence* presented to the Parliament of *Aix* their Confession of Faith, conformable to ours. Vpon the point of the Sacrament, they speak thus: *We are not entangled with any errors or heresies condemned by the Ancient Church,*

and

*and we hold the documents and instructions approved by the true Faith. And as for the Sacraments particularly, we have the Sacraments in honour, and beleeve that they be testimonies and signes by which Gods grace is confirmed and assured in our consciences. For which cause wee beleeve that Baptisme is a signe whereby the purgation that we obtaine by the blood of Jesus Christ, is corroborated, in such sort that it is the true washing of Regeneration and renovation. The Lords Supper is the signe under which the true Communion of his body and blood is given unto us.* And these poore Churches were the remainder of the horrible Persecutions exercised by the space of three or foure hundred yeares, by Kings and Princes at the instigation of Popes. Which Churches they had defamed with horrible heresies, accusing them to be *Manichees*, and enemies of Marriage: even as they accuse us now to be enemies unto the Saints and the blessed Virgin, and to beleeve that good workes are not necessary to salvation, and that we make God Author of sin.

A few yeares before, under the raigne of good King *Lewis* the XII. who was called the *Father of the People*, hapned a memora-

memorable thing which *Carolus Molinæus* a famous Jurisconsulte reciteth in his Booke of the *French Monarchie*. He saith that certaine Cardinals and Prelates did goe about to stirre up and incite this good King to destroy and exterminate the Inhabitants of *Cabrieres* and *Merindoles* in *Provence*, saying they were Sorcerers, Incestuous persons, hereticks, condemned already by the Apostolick Sea. But this King answered that he would condemne no body to death without hearing both sides, and be fully acquainted with the cause. And that for that end he sent one *Adam Fumé*, a Master of Request, and *John Parin* a Jacobin Frier, his Confessor, for to transport themselves into the place where they lived, and be informed of their Religion. Which they did, and *reported to the King, that among these men they had found no Images, nor any trace or vestige of any ornaments of Masses or Papall Ceremonies. That they had found nothing touching Magicall Artes, whoredomes and other crimes laid upon them. The King understanding this, cryed out with a lowde voice, and swore that those people were better Christians than hee and his people, and confirmed their*

*priviledges*

priviledges and immunities. That fell out about the yeare 1412. *Calvin* scarce being borne.

Pope *Julius* the second, made warres against this King: But the King defeated his Armie, and the Emperours, neare the City of *Ravenna*: Assembled a Councell at *Piso* against the Pope: Caused money to bee coyned with this Inscription round about. PER-DAM BABYLONIS NOMEN, as *Thuanus* relateth in the first Booke of his History.

But under the raigne of King *Francis* the first, Successor unto *Lewis* the twelfth, these poore Churches of *Provence* suffered hard and rude persecutions and Massacres. Nevertheless, they subsist yet at this day, and *Thuanus* in the sixth Booke of his History, speaketh of their Religion: Hee saith that these *Valdenses* (for hee tearmes them so) *did say that the Church of* Rome *had departed from the faith of Christ Jesus, and was become* Babylon, *and the great Whore whereof is spoken in the* Revelation: *That none ought to obey the Pope nor his Prelates: That Monachall life was a sinke of the Church, and an Infernall thing: That the fire*

of

of Purgatorie, the Masse, the Dedicat
of Churches, the Service of Saints,
Suffrages for the dead, were inventio
Satan. Then hee addeth: To these
and principall heads of their doctrine,
thees were falsly added, touching Ma
riage, the Resurrection, the state
condition of the dead, and touch
meates.

The same Author in the 27 Book
speaketh of the Churches of the Va
lies of the Alpes, which he saith
descended from the ancient Valdens
which have yet at this very day a Re
ligion altogether conformable to ours
and saith that in the yeare 1560 they
presented their Confession of Faith un
to those whom the Duke of Savoye their
Lord had sent them, by which they de
clared that they stuck fast and adhered
to the ancient doctrine contained in
the Old and New Testament, and to
the Apostles Creed, and to the foure
first Generall Councels, and that for the
rule of a good life they kept them
selves close to the tenne Commande
ments of the Law. That they taught to
live chastely, soberly, and justly, and to
yeeld obedience unto Princes and Ma
gistrates. That nevertheless they re-

jected

ted the Sacrifice of the Masse, the crament of Penance, Auricular Confion, humane Traditions, Prayers for dead, but cleaved to the holy Scripes. Which things they said to have eived not from *Calvin*, but from rist and his Apostles: For the strait ages and steepe places of the *Alpes* d preserved them from the persecutis of the Pope and his Ministers.

And at this very day also, the Church *Ethiopia*, which containeth 17 great ovinces, agrees with us in the fundmentall points of Faith, though she ve some small superstitions. For she eeveth not Purgatory, nor Transubantiation. Shee maketh no elevation or Adoration of the Hoste. Is not subect to the Pope. Knowes not what Indulgences meane, nor private Masses. Celebrateth the divine Service in the *Ethiopian* tongue. Gives the Communion to the People under both kindes. Worships no Images. Hath but one Table or Altar in the Church. Hath Monkes, but they are Married; and eate their living by the worke of their hands. Baptiseth not the male Children till forty dayes after their birth, and the females after threescore dayes: an

assured

assured sigue that she beleeves not
Baptisme of Water to be necessary
Salvation. These things are seen
the History of *Francis Alvarez*, a P
tugall Monke, who lived six years
the Court of the great *Negus* Empe
of *Ethiopia*.

The *Ethiopian* Churches are cal
niously and falsly accused to
*Eutichians*. True it is they be sub
to the Patriarch of *Alexandria* wh
an *Eutichian*. But that subjection is
in the doctrine, but onely in that
said Patriarch hath the right of no
nation of the *Abuna* or chief P
late of the *Ethiopians* when the Se
voide.

The *Greeke* Church more ancient t
the *Roman*, and of whom the Chu
of *Rome* received the Christian Reli
on, doth not acknowledge the Pop
rejecteth his Lawes, knoweth not w
his Indulgences are. Beleeveth neith
the Purgatory, nor the Transubstanti
tion. Celebrateth the divine Service
the *Greeke* tongue. Hath her Priests ma
ried. Hath no Liturgies or Private Ma
ses, and comes a greandeale neerer to o
Religion than to the Romish.

And this I say, not that we groun

our selves upon any of these examples, or would be authorised thereby. For we doe ground our selves only upon the word of God, and of his blessed Apostles, contained in the holy Scripture, unto which the Pope braggeth not to be subject, and doth not acknowledge it for Judge. In a word, we must stand firme upon this: To wit, that our Adversaries must shew us where their Religion was in the time of the Apostles, before wee doe shew them where our Religion was before *Calvin.*

## CHAP. XXIV.

### *That our Adversaries reject the Fathers, and speake of them with contempt.*

OVr Adversaries being pressed by the holy Scripture, are wont to have recourse to the Fathers, whom nevertheless they receive not for Judges, and acknowledge in them a multitude of errors, and speake of them with great contempt.

*Denis Petau*, a Jesuite, in his Notes upon *Epiphanius* pag. 244, speaketh thus. *In the most holy Fathers, and chiefly in Chrysostome his Homilies, are dispersed many things, which if thou wouldest accommodate to the rule of truth, shall be found to be voide of sense.*

Cardinall *Baronius* in his Annals in the year 34. §. 213. [a] *The Catholick Church doth not follow alwayes the most holy Fathers in the interpretation of the Scripture,* [b] *And in the* §. 185. *Hierome hath erred for lacke of memory.* And in the yeare 31. §. 24. he checks Saint *Austin* for not understanding well these words of the Lord, *Thou art Peter, &c.* And in the yeare 60. §. 20. he is vexed against *Theodoret*, because he rejected the service of Angels grounded upon a place of Saint *Paul, Colos.* 2. [c] *By this* (saith he) *it may be seene that Theodoret (with his good leave) did not well apprehend the Apostles meaning.* And in the yeare 369. §. 24. *Hilary had also his defects.*

*Alphonsus à Castro* in his first Booke

*Multa sunt à sãctissimis Patribus, præcipueque à Chrysostomo in Homilijs aspersa, quæ si ad exactæ veritatis regulam accommodare volueris, boni sensus maniæ videbuntur.*

[a] *Sanctissimos Patres in interpretatione Scripturæ non semper in omnibus Catholica sequitur Ecclesia.*

[b] *Consultius dicendũ putamus Hieronymum, (si tamen ille ipse est) ut humana fert infirmitas memoriâ lapsum.* [c] *Ex his videas haud feliciter (ejus pace dictum sit) Theodoretum assecutum esse Pauli verborum sensum.*

of

of *Heresies*, Chapter 7. [a] *Oftentimes the opinions of the Fathers are repugnant one to the other.*

*Melchior Canus* in his seventh Book of common places, Chapter 3. [b] *Seeing there is none of the Saints, except onely those that have written the Canonicall Bookes, but have spoken by the spirit of man, and sometimes erred in that which afterwards was knowne to belong to the Faith: It is evident that from such an authority none can build a certaine and assured Faith.* And thereupon he produceth for an example, the errors of many Fathers, so farre as to say that *against the ordinary course of nature they bring forth monsters.*

*Sixtus Senensis* in the Preface upon the fifth Booke of his *Bibliotheca*: [c] *These ancient Masters of the Churches have sometimes swerved from the scope of the truth at which they aimed.* And in the same place: [d] *In the Bookes of the holy Doctors, whose authority is read in the Church, are found sometimes things wicked and hereticall:* and he speaketh this after *Anselme*

[a] *Sanctorũ Patrum sententiæ sæpe invicem repugnant.*

[b] *Nũ. 2. Cũ Sanctorum quisque, his duntaxat exceptis qui libros Canonicos ediderunt, humano spiritu locutus fuerit, & aliquãdo vel in eo errarit quod ad fidem pertinere postea demonstratum est, &c.*

[c] *Prisci illi Ecclesiarũ Magistri nonnihil interdum à proposito veritatis scopo aberraverunt.*

[d] *In libris sanctorum Doctorum quos authentica legit Ecclesia, nonnunquam inveniuntur quædam prava vel hæretica.*

in his Commentaries upon the second to the *Corinthians*.

[a] §81. *Hoc dico persuasum me habere D. Augustinum, si nostra fuisset aetate, longe aliter sensurum fuisse. Et* §. 71. *Hanc interpretationem multo magis probo quàm illam Augustini.*

*Maldonat* the Jesuite upon the sixth of Saint *John*, checking Saint *Austin* for not well conceiving in what sense Christ calleth himselfe the bread, saith, [a] *I am perswaded that if* Austin *had lived in our dayes, he would have beene of an other opinion.* And in the same place: *I doe approve of this interpretation much more than that of* Austins.

*Cardinall Cajetan* in the beginning of his Commentaries upon *Genesis*: [b] *Let none detest a new sense of the Scripture, under colour it disagreeth from the ancient Doctors. For God hath not tyed the Exposition of the Scriptures to the sense or opinions of the ancient Doctors.*

[b] *Nullus detestetur novum sacræ Scripturæ sensum, ex hoc quod dissonat à priscis Doctoribus. Non enim alligavit Deus*

*Andradius* in his second Booke of the defense of the Faith of *Trent*: [c] *I say nothing of Austin, Basil, Athanasius, but Cyrils, Chrysostome, and Epiphanius, to whose opinions we are not alwayes tyed.*

*Pererius* the Jesuite, in his eighth Book upon *Genesis*, Disp. 1. [d] *I am ashamed to*

*expositionem Scripturarum priscorum Doctorum sensibus.* [c] *Vt Augustinum, Basilium, &c. taceam, quorum non semper sumus opinionibus addicti.* [d] *Pudet dicere quæ de optimis scriptoribus hoc loco dicturus sum, adeo sunt non modo falsa, sed pudenda & absurda.*

tell

ell what I must say here against the best writers, so much doe they say things not only false, but also shamefull and absurde. Now the Fathers whom he meaneth, are Iustin Martyr, Ireneus, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyprian, Ambrose, Lactantius, Eusebius, Sulpitius Severus.

Salmeron the Jesuite in the eight Prolegomene: [a]Every Father expoundeth one place of the Scripture otherwise than the rest, yea one and the same Father expounds it in severall fashions. And in the third Prolegomene, pag. 13. he bringeth many examples of Fathers which contradict themselves.

The same man in the 51 Disput. upon the Epistle to the *Romanes*, acknowledgeth that the Fathers generally are against him in the point of the Conception of the Virgin *Mary*. Whereupon he shifts off thus; [b]*Against this multitude objected against us, we answer by the Word of God*, Exodus 23. *Thou shalt not yeeld in judgement to the opinion of many, for to decline from the truth.*

*Cornelius Mus* Bishop of *Bitonto*, upon the 14 chapter of the Epistle to the *Romanes*: *I would give more credit*

[a] Pag. 85 *Quisque Patrum diverse ab alio unum locum exponit, immo etiam unus & idem varie modo.*

[b] *Contra hanc quam objectant multitudinem, respondemus ex verbo Dei,* Exod. 23. *In judicio, plurimorum non acquiescas sententiæ, ut devies à vero.*

[c] *Ego (ut ingenuè fatear) plus uni summo Pontifici crediderim in his quæ fidei mysteria tangunt, quàm mille Augustinis, Hieronymis, Gregorys.*

(to confesse it ingennously) to one Pope, than to a thousand Austins, a thousand Hieromes, a thousand Gregories.

I should never make an end if I would produce all the places wherein our Adversaries abuse the Fathers, and accuse them of error, or of untruth, or of ignorance: and have reason in some things, in others not. [a] *Chrysostome* accuseth often the Virgin *Mary* of mbition, temeritie, and importunitie. [b] *Justin Martyr* and *Clement Alexandrinus* say, that God created the Sun and the Moone, that the *Gentiles* might worship them, least they should bee without Religion. [c] *Justin, Ireneus, Lactantius, Ambrose, Tertullian*, and many others, were Chiliastes, holding a Reigne of Christ that is to endure one thousand yeares in feastings and carnall delights. [d] *Ambrose* teacheth that Baptisme conferred in the name of the Holy Ghost, without naming the Father or the Sonne, is good and warrantable. *Austin* hath condemned the Children dead without Baptisme, to the eternall flames. *Cyprian* taught the Rebaptization of Hereticks, and assembled a Councell, in which hee did condemne the doctrine of the Roman Church.

[a] *Chrys. homil. 45. in Matth. & 21. in Iohannem.*

[b] *Iustin. Dial. in Tryph. Clem. Strom.*

[c] See Ireneus in his 5. Booke.

[d] *Lib. 1. de Spiritu Sancto. c. 2.*

[a] *Hilary*

[a] Hilary taught that our Saviour Christ suffered no paine at his death: And that the Virgin *Mary* is to be purged by the fire of the last judgement. [b] Saint *Hierome* calleth Marriage an ignominie, the end whereof is death, and the persons married, Vessels unto dishonour. He taught also that Bishops and Priests are equall by divine right. Whereupon *Bellarmin* in his first Booke *de Pontif.* chap. 8. saith: *This opinion is false and must bee refuted in its due place.* Gregory of *Nice* in the first Oration of the Lords Resurrection, teacheth that when Christ instituted the Eucharist, his body was already dead, and that his Soule was in hell. For which he is censured by the Jesuite *Salmeron*, saying: [d] *In these words of Gregory there are many things which the Church doth not approve of.* *Clemens Alexandrinus* teacheth that the Pagans were saved by Philosophy. *Tertullian* maketh God to be corporall. *Clement* the first, Bishop of *Rome*, in a Decretall Epistle, will have goods and women to be common. In the ninth Tome of *Baronius* Annales, there is an Epistle of Pope *Gregory* the second, wherein hee declareth that it is not lawfull to paint out God the Father:

[a] *Lib. 10. de Trinitate. & in Psal. 68, & 138. & in Psal. 118. litera Gimel.*

[b] *Hier. lib. 1. & 2. in Iovinianū, & sæpe alibi.*

[c] *Hier. in Epist. ad Titum c. 1.*

[d] Salm. Tomo XI. Tract. 7. de modo resurr. Christi pag. 49. *Cujus in verbis continentur multa non satis in Ecclesia recepta.*

[a] *Postea usu veniſſe ut pingatur in Eccleſia Deus, &c.*

But *Baronius* [a] noteth in the margent, that the Church now hath ordained of it otherwiſe.

Six hundred and thirty Biſhops decreed at the Councell of Chalcedone, that the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* ſhould be equall in all things to the Biſhop of *Rome*. The *Milevitan* Councell where Saint *Auſtin* was preſent, and framed the Canons of it, forbiddeth upon paine of a curſe, to appeale beyond the Sea, that is to ſay to appeale out of *Africk* to *Rome*.

The ſixth Councell of *Carthage* confirmeth the ſame prohibition, and writeth to *Celeſtin* Biſhop of *Rome* long Letters which are inſerted in the Councel, wherein the Councel warnes him to take heed henceforth from receiving any appeales out of Africk, and not to ſend them his Legats any more; nor make uſe any more of ſuppoſed Canons for to advance his authority, and not to bring in worldly pride into the Church. In all theſe things and in a thouſand others more, the *Roman* Church condemneth the Fathers, and maketh no reckoning of their authority. Whence appeareth that it is to no purpoſe that our Adverſaries in certaine queſtions alledge

ledge the Fathers unto us, seeing themves reject them, and subject them to e Judgement of the Pope and Church Rome.

## CHAP XXV.

### *of the corruption and falsification of the Fathers writings: and of the difficultie to understand them.*

IN the allegation of Fathers about our Controversies we have this disdvantage, that we have them but by the hands of our owne Adversaries. For all the impressions that have been made of them, were made upon the Manuscripts found in Monasteries, written by Monkes, who had faire opportunitie to clip and alter them at their pleasure, and set old titles upon new Bookes made and composed by themselves. It is a hard case to one of the parties that goes to Law, when he can make use of no other writings but of such as his owne Adverse party furnisheth

nisheth him with, who hath thrusted in such clauses as seemed good unto him. But it is come to passe through the Providence of God, that the most part of these falsifications are so grosse and so palpable, that we have not had much paines to discover the falsity of many places and false Workes, which are in so great number, that if they were taken away, the Fathers Workes would bee found diminished of a third part. Those among our Adversaries that are well read in the Fathers, acknowledge the same with us, and passe condemnation in this point. Reade *Sixtus Senensis* about the end of his fourth Booke, and the Booke of Cardinall *Bellarmin Of Ecclesiasticall Writers*, where he hath put the Catalogue of the Fathers Works. There shall ye wonder to see the multitude of Bookes, which he saith to be doubtfull or manifestly counterfeit. Which causes men to doubt of the other Workes, whose falsitie is not easilie found out.

For the discovering of these falsities, we have beene helped by the Catalogue of the Workes of Ancient Writers, which *Photius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, who wrote about the yeare of our Lord

Lord 878. hath put into his Library. And by *Gennadius*, a Prieſt of *Marſeilles*, that wrote a Booke of the *Illuſtrious men*, about the yeare of our Lord 492. *Item* by the diverſity of ſtile. *Item* by certaine places of the Fathers, which are alleadged by *Ivo*, *Gratian*, *Burchardus*, *Lombard*, *Thomas* and others, quite otherwiſe than they bee found in the editions printed in this laſt age. *Item* by other places of the ſame Fathers which ſay the contrary: ſo that one and the ſame Father is oftentimes found to contrarie himſelfe.

Even as the ninth Age was the Age wherein the Decretals of the ancient Biſhops of *Rome* were forged, under the name of one *Iſidorus Mercator*, which was falſely framed for the grounding of the Papall Monarchy, which with might and maine was a building in that Age: So the eleventh Age, in which *Berengarius*, Archdeacon of *Angiers*, withſtood and impugned ſtoutly and vigorouſly the opinion of the reall preſence and Tranſubſtantiation, was the Age wherein were forged ſundry works in the behalf of that error, and divers clauſes were chopt into the Books of the ancient Fathers. Of this

falſe

falſe coyne is the Book attributed to *Cyprian, of the Lords Supper, which all the learned of the Roman Church acknowledge not to be of his making. And the Catbecheſes Myſtagogicall of Cyril of Jeruſalem. The Catecheſes of Gregory of Nyſſe are indeed his, but horribly corrupted and full of errors, which the Roman Church approves not. There is mention made there of one Severus an Heretick, who is poſterior to this Gregory above 150. yeares.

* Bellar. lib. de Script. Eccleſ. Sixtus Senenſis ſub finem libri quart.

Of theſe falſifications and divers others, we have entreated more at large in the Book againſt Cardinal du Perron. He that ſhould take away from the works of Cyprian, Ambroſe, Hierome, Auſtin and Athanaſius, the counterfeit Books, ſhould diminiſh the writings of theſe Fathers more than of a third part.

Wherefore after ſo many falſities diſcovered, when our adverſaries object us ſome place of a Father, we might very juſtly deſire them to proveunto us that that place was not added or depraved by ſome falſifier aſwell as ſo many others. By all manner of reaſons, if in an writing brought in juſtice there be found but one falſification, the whole inſtrument loſeth all its force and is rejected.

There

There is another difficulty that deceiveth such men as are not wel seen in antiquity, to wit, that the words used in old time, have now changed their signification. In the Fathers are found these words, of Pope, of Sacrifice, of Oblation, of Purging fire, of Indulgence, of Station, of Species, of Monke, of Penance; but quite in another sense than these words are taken at this day.

Notwithstanding these difficulties and disadvantages, whereby our adversaries strive to prevaile against us, we refuse not for all that to buckle with the. For what falsifications soever were made in the Books of Ancient writers, yet in them remaines still so many expresse and formall places against Transubstantiation, that of the collection of them, a man might make a great volume. Wee have produced above 500 in the Book of the *Novelty of Popery*; and Mr le *Faucheur*, and Mr *Aubertin* have laboured lately, and taken paines about this subject, with a most exact diligence and full of great learning. Here wee will content our selves to produce some few places for a taste, yet with this protestation, that I do not alleadge the Fathers for to be a stay to our cause, which is sufficiently propped and esta-

blished

bliſhed upon the Word of God. G
doth not beg the teſtimonies of men.
word is as ſtrong alone, as being
companied with humane teſtimon
To goe about to defend it with
teſtimonies of men ſubject to erro
is as if a man would lighten the Su
with a Candle. But wee doe alleg
the Fathers for to defend their h
nour, becauſe that againſt their
cent, our Adverſaries make them A
vocates of a bad cauſe; And for
condeſcend and yeeld ſome thing
the diſeaſe of this froward age, whe
in the holy Scripture hath loſt its po
er and efficacy, and which armeth
ſelfe with human teſtimonies again
the Word of God.

CHAP. XXVI.

## CHAP. XXVI.

*Places of the Fathers contrary to Transubstantiation, and to the manducation of the body of Christ by the corporall mouth.*

*Tertullian* in his fourth Booke against *Marcion* chapter, 40. disputing against the *Marcionites* that denyed Christ to have a true humane body, speaketh thus: [a] *Christ when he had taken the bread and distributed it to his disciples, made it to be his body, saying, This is my body, that is to say the figure of my body. But it were not a figure, unlesse it were a true body.* His reason is, because men represent not by figure the things that are not.

And in the third Booke, chapter 19. *Christ called the bread his body, that thereby thou mightest understand that he gave for the bread to be the figure of his body.*

*Origen* upon the fifteenth Chapter of Saint *Matthew*, speaking of that which the Faithfull receive by the corporall mouth in the Eucharist:

[a] *Acceptum panem & distributum discipulis corpus suũ illum fecit, dicendo, Hoc est corpus meum, id est figura corporis mei. Figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus.*

[b] *Panem suum corpus appellans, ut & hinc jam eum intelligas corporis sui figuram pani dedisse.*

a *If*

* *If every thing that entereth into the mouth, goes into the belly, and is sent into the privy: this food which is sanctified by the Word of God and by the Prayer, as it is materiall, goes into the belly, and is sent into the privy.* And a little after, *And thus much be said touching the typicall and symbolicall body of Christ.* Vpon this place Cardinall du *Perron* writing against du *Plessis*, maketh many exclamations against *Origen*, and cals him *origine of all errors*, and cries out, *Shut your eares Christian people*, as if men did read with their eares. What Cardinall du *Perron* saith, that *Theophilus* Patriarck of *Alexandria* did condemne *Origen* for speaking so, is false, and shall never be found.

*Theodoret* in his first Dialogue titled the *Vnchangeable*, speaking of these words, *This is my body*, saith, * *The Lord hath honored the visible signes with the appellation of his body and blood, not having changed their nature, but having added grace to nature.*

A little before, he had said, *The Lord gave to the signe the name of his body.*

And in the second Dialogue tearmed the *Non confuse*, *The divine mysteries are signes of the true body.* And a little after, he introduceth an *Eutychian* Heretick maintaining

* *Quod si quicquid ingreditur in os, in ventrē abit, & in secessum ejicitur, & ille cibus qui sanctificatur per verbū Dei, perque obsecrationē, juxta id quod habet materiale in ventrem abit & in secessū emittitur, &c. Et hæc quidem de typico symbolicoq; corpore.*

* Τὰ σύμβολα τῇ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορίᾳ τετίμηκον, ἀΐτ' φύσιν μεταβαλῶν, ἀλλὰ τῇ φύσει τὴν χάριν προστεθεικώς.

taining Transubstantiation. To whom he answereth in these words, *Thou art caught by the nets that thou hast woven. For even after the consecration, the mystic all signes do not change their own nature,* * *For they remaine in their former Substance, Forme and Figure.* And in the same Dialogue, *Tell me then, the signes that are offered unto God, what signes are they of?* The answer is, *Of the Lords body and blood.*

* Μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας.

In the Books of Sacraments attributed to S. *Ambrose*, in the fourth Book, cha. 5. We have a clause of the publick forme used in the Eucharist, in these words, a *Grãt that this oblation be imputed unto us, as acceptable, reasonable, which is the FIGVRE of the body and blood of Christ Iesus our Lord.* Which cannot be understood of the unconsecrated bread, for it is not an acceptable oblation for our sins. This clause is retained in the Masse, except this word, Figure, which they have taken away.

a *Dixit Sacerdos, Fac nobis hanc oblationem asscriptam, rationabilẽ, acceptabilẽ, quod est figura corporis & sanguinis Domini nostri Iesus Christi.*

*Eusebius* in his 12 Book of the *Demonstration*, chap. 8. b *We have been instructed to celebrate at the table, according to the laws of the New Testament, by the signes of the body and blood, the remembrance of this*

b Τούτου δέκτα τοῦ σώματος τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτραπέζης ἐκτελεῖν διὰ συμβόλων τοῦ τε σώματος αὐτῆς καὶ αἵματος παρειλοφότες.

*Sacrifice.* And in the eight Book, after he had said *that Christ delivered to his Disciples the signes or symboles of his dispensation,* he addeth [a] *Commanding to celebrate the Image or figure of his own Body.*

*Euphræmius* Patriarck of *Antioch*: [b] *Christs body which the Faithfull receive, loseth not its sensible substance, and is not divided from intelligible grace. So Baptisme being wholly made spirituall and one, doth retaine the property of its sensible substance, to wit water, and yet looseth not that which it is made.* This place is very forcible; for he calleth the bread Christs body, and acknowledges not therein any conversion of substance, and teacheth that in the Eucharist there is no more conversion of substance than in Baptisme where the water remaineth always water.

*Gregory Nazianzen* in his 2. Oration of the Passeover speaketh thus of the participation of the Eucharist: [c] *We shall indeed be partakers of the Passeover in figure, though more evidently than in the old Passeover: For the Passeover (I dare say) was a more darke figure of a figure.*

And the same Father in his Oration in the Praise of his Sister *Gorgonia*, commendeth her devotion, in that having received with her own hand the Sacra-

ment

[a] Τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος ποιεῖσθαι παρακελευόμενος

[b] Ex Bibliothe. Phocii p. 415. editionis Augustanæ. Τὸ παρὰ τῶν πιστῶν λαμβανόμενον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἐξίσταται, &c.

[c] Μεταληψόμεθα τοῦ πάσχα, νῦν μὲν τυπικῶς ἔτι, εἰ καὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ γνωριμώτερον. τὸ γὰρ νομικὸν πάσχα (τολμῶ καὶ λέγειν) τύπου ἦν τυπος ἀμυδρότερος.

ment, she carried back home a parcell of
. [a] If (saith he) her hand had shut up as in
treasure any thing of the signes or antitypes
of the body or of the blood of the Lord, she min-
gled it with her teares.

Euphramius Deacon of Edissa: [b] Behold
diligently how the Lord after hee had taken
the bread in his hands, blessed it, and brake it,
a figure of his immaculat body, and blessed
the cup in figure of his precious blood, and gave
to his Disciples.

The imperfect work upon S. Matthew
attributed to Chrysostome, in the 11 Ho-
mily, speaking of those that imploy the
sacred vessels, as Plates and Chalices, to
profane uses: [c] If it be so dangerous a thing
to transport to privat uses the sacred vessels
wherein Christs body is not, but where the my-
stery of his body is contained, how much more
the vessels of our bodies which God hath pre-
pared to himse fe for to dwell in them? Note
that hee doth not say that the body of
Christ was not in these vessels, but that it
was not in them, that it may not be thought
hee speaketh of the vessels of Salomons
Temple.

[a] Εἰ τοῦ τι ἀντιτύπου τοῦ τιμίου σώματος ἢ αἵματος ἢ χερὶ ἐθησαύρισεν. &c.

[b] Ad eos, qui Filii Dei naturam scrutari volunt. Inspice diligenter, quomodo sumens in manibus panē, benedixit ac fregit in figuram immaculati corporis, &c.

[c] Si hec vasa sanctificata ad privatos usus transferre periculosum est, in quibus non est verum corpus Christi, sed mysterium corporis ejus continetur, quanto magis vasa corporis nostri? &c.

*Sacrifice.* And in the eight Book, after he had said *that Christ delivered to his Disciples the signes or symboles of his dispensation*, he addeth [a] *Commanding to celebrate the Image or figure of his own Body.*

*Euphræmius* Patriarck of *Antioch*: [b] *Christs body which the Faithfull receive, loseth not its sensible substance, and is not divided from intelligible grace. So Baptisme being wholly made spirituall and one, doth retaine the property of its sensible substance, to wit water, and yet looseth not that which it is made.* This place is very forcible; for he calleth the bread Christs body, and acknowledges not therein any conversion of substance, and teacheth that in the Eucharist there is no more conversion of substance than in Baptisme where the water remaineth always water.

*Gregory Nazianzen* in his 2. Oration of the Passeover speaketh thus of the participation of the Eucharist: [c] *We shall indeed be partakers of the Passeover in figure, though more evidently than in the old Passeover: For the Passeover (I dare say) was a more darke figure of a figure.*

And the same Father in his Oration in the Praise of his Sister *Gorgonia*, commendeth her devotion, in that having received with her own hand the Sacra-

[a] Τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος ποιεῖσθαι παρακελευόμενος

[b] Ex Bibliothe. Phocii p. 415. editionis Augustanæ. Τὸ παρὰ τῶν πιστῶν λαμβανόμενον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἐξίστωται, &c.

[c] Μεταληψόμεθα τοῦ πάσχα, νῦν μὲν τυπικῶς ἔτι, εἰ καὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ γνωριμώτερον. τὸ γὰρ νομικὸν πάσχα (τολμῶ καὶ λέγειν) τύπου ἦν τυπος ἀμυδρότερος.

ment, she carried back home a parcell of
. [a] If (saith he) her hand had shut up as in
treasure any thing of the signes or antitypes
the body or of the blood of the Lord, she min-
ed it with her teares.

Euphramius Deacon of Edissa: [b] Behold
ligently how the Lord after hee had taken
bread in his hands, blessed it, and brake it,
figure of his immaculat body, and blessed
cup in figure of his precious blood, and gave
to his Disciples.

The imperfect work upon S. Matthew
tributed to Chrysostome, in the 11 Ho-
ily, speaking of those that imploy the
red vessels, as Plates and Chalices, to
ofane uses: [c] If it be so dangerous a thing
transport to privat uses the sacred vessels
rein Christ body is not, but where the my-
ry of his body is contained, how much more
vessels of our bodies which God hath pre-
red to himse fe for to dwell in them? Note
t hee doth not say that the body of
rist was not in these vessels, but that it
at in them, that it may not be thought
e speaketh of the vessels of Salomons
emple.

[a] Εἰ τοῦ τι ἀντιτύπου τοῦ τιμίου σώματος ἢ αἵματος ἢ χωρ ἐθησαυρίσειν. &c.

[b] Ad eos, qui Filii Dei naturam scrutari volunt. *Inspice diligenter, quomodo sumens in manibus panē, benedixit ac fregit in figuram immaculati corporis, &c.*

[c] *Si hæc vasa sanctificata ad privatos usus transferre periculosum est, in quibus non est verum corpus Christi, sed sterium corporis ejus continetur, quanto magis vasa corporis stri? &c.*

Saint *Hierome* [a] in his second Book against *Jovinian*: *Our Lord for a type his blood hath not offered water, but W* And the Commentary upon the first the *Corinthians*, Chapter. 11. attribu to Saint *Hierome*: [b] *Christ left us a l remembrance, as if any man going a j ney, should leave some token to one tha loveth.*

Saint *Austin* in the 12 Chapter gainst *Adimantus*: [c] *The Lord mad difficultie to say, This is my body, whe gave the signe of his body.*

And in the 23 Epistle to *Bonifac* after hee hath brought many exam of figurative kind of speeches, as w two dayes before Easter we say, *Ch dyed this day*: and when on the Sund we say *Christ is risen this day*, bec those dayes are destinated for to c brate the remembrance of the Lo Passion and Resurrection, hee add that after the same kinde of speak we say that Christ is still Sacrificed: H be his words: [d] *Was not Christ once Sa fieed in himself? and yet in the Sacra*

[a] *In typum sanguinis ejus non obtulit aquã, sed vinum.*

[b] *Christus Ultimam nobis commemorationem, sive memoriam dereliquit. Quemadmodum si quis peregre proficiscens, aliquod pignus ei quem valde diligit derelinquat.*

[c] *Dominus non dubitavit dicere Hoc est corpus meum, cùm daret signũ corporis sui.*

[d] *Nonne semel Christus immolatus est in se ipso? & tamen in Sacramento non solùm per omnes Paschæ solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur: nec utique mentitur qui interrogatus, respondent immolari.*

*t onely at every ſolemnity of Eaſter, but ſo every day he is ſacrificed to the People, d he tels no lie who being examined, an- ereth that he is Sacrificed.* Marke that is good Doctor teacheth that Chriſt Sacrificed every day in the ſame man- r as every Sunday he is riſen, and he dies every Friday before Eaſter, t really, but by commemoration.

He addeth, [a] *For if the ſacred ſignes d not ſome reſemblance of the things ereof they be ſacred ſignes, they would be ſacred ſignes at all: But becauſe of t reſemblance, they take the name of the ngs themſelves. Even then as in ſome nner the ſacred ſigne of the body of Chriſt Chriſts body, and the ſacred ſigne of his od, his blood. So the Sacrament of the ith (to wit Baptiſme) is the Faith.* eſe words no doubt, grieve our Ad- rſaries heart: For what can a man more expreſſe? Would they ſuffer man that ſhould ſay that the conſe- ated hoſte is in a manner the body of hriſt? Or that it is Chriſts body in e ſame manner as Chriſt dieth every iday before Eaſter? and in the ſame ſhion as Baptiſme is Faith? and a ſacred gne that taketh the name of the thing gnified?

[a] *Si enim Sacramenta quædam ſimilitudinem illarum rerum quarum Sacramenta ſunt non haberent, omnino Sacramenta non eſſent. Ex hac autem ſimilitudine plerunque ipſarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo ſecundum quendam modum Sacramentum corporis Chriſti corpus Chriſti eſt, ita Sacramentum fidei fides eſt.*

The ſame Fathers upon the third Pſalme: [a] *The Lord admitted* Judas to *the banquet, in which he recommended and gave to his diſciples the figure of his body and blood.*

The ſame, in his third Booke of Chriſtian Doctrine, Chapter 16. *When the Lord ſaith,* [b] *Except yee eate the fleſh of the Sonne of man and drinke his blood, ye have no life in you, he ſeemeth to command a wicked thing or hainous offence. It is therefore a figure, that commands to communicate to the Paſſion of the Lord, and to ſweetly and profitably into our memory that his fleſh was crucified and wounded for us.* Note that Saint *Auſtin* ſaith not onely that theſe words *Except yee eate, &c.* are figurative: But alſo expounds unto us the ſenſe and meaning of the figure, ſaying, that it ſignifieth we muſt meditate with pleaſure and profit that Chriſt is dead for us. Which is an expoſition our Adverſaries approve not.

The ſame Author in the firſt Treatiſe upon the firſt Epiſtle of Saint *John*

[a] *Dominus Iudam admiſit ad conuiuium in quo corporis & ſanguinis ſui figuram diſcipulis commendauit & tradidit.*

[b] *Non (inquit) carnem ſilly hominis & biberitis ſanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis; facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere. Figura ergo eſt præcipiens paſſioni Dominicæ eſſe communicandum & ſuauiter atque utiliter in memoria recondendum quod caro ejus pro nobis crucifixa & vulnerata ſit.*

[c] The Lord comforteth us, we that can handle him no more with our hands, but touch him by Faith.

And in the 53 Sermon of the words of the Lord: [d] All almost doe call the body of Christ that which is the sacred signe of it: Words that are very considerable.

And in the 27 Treatise upon Saint John: [e] The Capernaites thought he should distribute his body unto them; but he said unto them hee would ascend into heaven whole indeed. When yee see the Sonne of man ascend where he was before, certainly, then at least, you shall see that he giveth not his body as you esteeme. Verily then shall yee understand that his grace is not consumed with biting.

Chiefly that place of the same Father upon the 98 Psalme, seemes to me very expresse, where expounding these words of the Lord, Except ye eate the flesh of the Sonne of man, yee have no life in you, he bringeth in the Lord speaking thus: [f] Understand spiritually what I

[c] Dominus consolans nos, qui ipsum jam in cœlo sedentem manu contrectare non possumus, sed fide continere.

[d] Pene quidem Sacramentum omnes corpus ejus dicunt.

[e] Illi putabant eum erogaturū corpus suū, ille adixit se ascensurum in cœlum utiq; integrum. Cum videritis filium hominis ascendentem, ubi erat prius, certe vel tunc videbitis, quia non eo modo quo putatis, erogat corpus suum. Certe vel tunc intelligetis quod ejus gratia non consumitur morsibus.

[f] Spiritaliter intelligite quod locutus sum. Non hoc corpus quod videturi manducaturi estis, & bibituri illum sanguinem quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi, spiritaliter intellectum vivificabit vos.

have said unto you, yee shall not eate the body that you see, nor drinke that blood which shall bee shed by those that shall crucifie me. I have commended a sacred signe unto you, which being understood spiritually, shall vivifie you.

According to our Adversaries doctrine, both good and bad take the Lords body in the Buchariſt. For many be partakers of the Sacrament without Faith and hypocritically. Such nevertheleſſe, doe ſwallow the conſecrated hoſte and (if we beleeve our Adverſaries) eate truly and really the body of Chriſt Jeſus. Saint *Auſtin* impugneth that opinion, and maintaineth that the wicked eate but the ſignes, and receive not Chriſt. In the 26 Treatiſe upon Saint *John*, "Whoſoever dwelleth not in Chriſt, and in whom Chriſt dwelleth not, for a certaine he eateth not his fleſh ſpiritually, and drinketh not his blood, though he preſſeth carnally and viſibly with his teeth the ſacred ſignes of Chriſts body and blood.

And in the Booke of Sentences of Saint *Auſtin* collected by *Proſper*: "Whoſoever diſcordeth with Chriſt, eateth

§ Qui non manet in Chriſto, & in quo non manet Chriſtus, procul dubio nec manducat ſpiritaliter carnem ejus nec bibit ejus ſanguinem, licet carnaliter & viſibiliter premat dentibus Sacramentum corporis et ſanguinis Chriſti.

§ Sent. 139 Qui diſcordat à Chriſto, nam carnē ejus manducat nec ſanguinem bibit, etiamſi tantæ rei Sacramentum ad judicium ſuæ præſumptionis quotidie indifferenter accipiat.

eat the flesh of Christ, and drinketh not his blood, though hee take every day indifferently the sacred signe of so great a thing, to the condemnation of his owne presumption.

And in the 25 Chapter of the 21. Booke *Of the City of God*, [j] *It must not bee said that he who is not in the body of Christ, eateth the body of Christ.* And there he bringeth in Christ saying, [k] *He that abideth not in me, and in whom I abide not, let not him say nor thinke that he eateth my body or drinketh my blood. Therefore those doe not abide in Christ, that are not the members of Christ.*

[j] *Non dicendum, cum manducare corpus Christi qui in corpore Christi non est.*

[k] *Qui non in me manet, et in quo ego nō maneo, non se dicat aut existimet manducare corpus meum, &c.*

Saint *Hierome* saith the same, upon the last Chapter of *Esaiah*: [l] *While st they are not holy in body and spirit, they eate not the flesh of Jesus, and drinke not that blood whereof he speaketh himselfe, Whosoever eateth my flesh, &c.*

[l] *Dum non sunt sancti corpore et spiritu, non comedunt carnem Iesu, neque bibunt sanguinem.*

Let no man wonder that I have turned this word, Sacrament, in Saint *Austin*, by a sacred signe: seeing that he himselfe expoundeth it so in the fifth Epistle to *Marcellinus*: [m] *The signes, when they belong to divine things, are called Sacraments.* And in the tenth Booke of the

[m] *Signa cum ad res divinas pertinent, Sacramenta appellantur.*

City

City of God, Chapter 5. [n] *The visible Sacrifice is a Sacrament of the invisible Sacrifice, that is to say, a sacred signe.* And against the adversarie of the Law and the Prophets, 2 Booke, Chapter 9. *Sacramenta, id est sacra signa. The Sacraments, that is to say, the sacred signes.* It is the definition given by *Lombard* in the first Distinction of the fourth Book, Tit. 3. *Sacramentum est sacræ rei signum.* *Bellarmin* himselfe in his first Booke of Sacraments, [o] Chapter 7. & 11. *The word Sacrament signifieth a signe of a sacred or secret thing.*

In one thing principally it appeareth how farre Saint *Austin* was from beleeving Transubstantiation: In that in these words *This is my body*, by this word *Body* he understandeth the *Church*. At the end of *Fulgentius* his Workes, who was *Austins* disciple, there is a Sermon of *Austins* which maliciously they have plucked out of his Workes, and that had been lost, if *Fulgentius* and *Beda* had not preserved it. Here then be the very words of *Austin*: [p] *What ye have seene, is bread and wine, as your eyes shew unto you; but according to the instruction that your Faith demandeth, the bread is the body of Christ, and the Cup is his blood.*

Bellarmin

[n] *Sacrificium visibile est invisibilis Sacrificij Sacramentum, id est sacrum signum.*

[o] *Sacramentum nomen genericum significat signum rei sacræ vel arcanæ.*

[p] *Aug. Serm. ad infantes. Quod vidistis, panis est et calix, quod vobis etiam oculi vestri renuntiant; quod autē fides vestra postulat instruenda, panis est corpus Christi.*

*Bellarmin* in his first Booke of the Eucharist, Chapter 1. acknowledgeth that these words *This bread is Christs body*, cannot be true if they be not taken figuratively. But let us learne how Saint *Austin* will have the bread to be the body of Christ. He saith then, [q] *How is the bread his body? and how is the Cup his blood? These things Brethren, are called Sacraments, because in them one thing is seene, and another is understood. What is seene, hath a corporall forme: What is meant, hath a spirituall fruite. If then thou wilt understand what the body of Christ is, heare the Apostle saying to the Faithfull, Ye are Christs body and his members. If ye bee therefore Christs body and members, your mysterie is set on the table of the Lord, &c.* He giveth the same exposition in the 26 Treatise upon Saint *John*. *By this meate, and by this drinke, the Lord will have to bee understood the society and fellowship of his body and of his members, to wit the holy Church of the Predestinate.*

And in the *Roman* Canon, in the 2. Distinction of the Consecration at the Ca-

[q] *Quomodo est panis corpus ejus & calix, vel quod habet calix, quomodo est sanguis ejus? Ista fratres, ideo dicuntur Sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur, formam habet corporalem: quod intelligitur fructū habet spiritalem. Corpus ergo Christi si vis intelligere, audi Apostolum dicentem fidelibus, Vos estis corpus Christi et membra, &c.*

non

non Hoc est: [a] *The heavenly bread which is the flesh of Christ, is after its manner called the body of Christ, although to speake truely it be the sacred signe of Christs body, to wit of that which being visible, palpable, mortall, was put upon the Crosse.* And thereupon the Glosse of the Doctors hath these words, which truely are excellent: *The heavenly Sacrament that representeth truely the flesh of Christ, is called the body of Christ, but improperly, for it is thus called after its manner, but not according to the truth of the thing, but by a significant mystery. So that the sense is, that it is called the body of Christ, that is to say, that it is signified.*

[a] *Cœlestis panis, qui Christi caro est, suo modo vocatur corpus Christi, cum re vera sit sacramentũ corporis Christi illius: videlicet quod palpabile, mortale in cruce positum est.* Et ib. Glos. *Cœleste Sacramentum quod vere repræsentat Christi carnem dicitur corpus Christi, sed* [b] *improprie, verum dicitur suo modo, sed non re ipsa veritate, sed significante mysterio. Vt sit sensus, vocatur Christi corpus, id est significatur.* [b] §. 9. *Quando in calice vino aqua miscetur, Christo populus adunatur, &c. Si vinum tantum quis offerat, sanguis Christi incipit esse sine nobis: si vero aqua sit sola, plebs incipit esse sine Christo.*

S. *Cyprian* in his 63 Epistle will have in the sacred Cup water to be mingled with the wine. His reason is because that as the wine is the blood of Christ, so the water is the People: and that the People ought not to bee divided from Christ. *If* (saith he) *any one offereth nothing but wine, Christs blood beginneth to bee without us, but if the water be alone, the people begins*

to be without Christ. Whereby it followeth, that as *Cyprian* did not beleeve that the water was transubstantiated into the people: so did he not beleeve that the wine was transubstantiated into the body of Christ.

And in the same Epistle: [c] *That which Christ called his blood, was wine.* And in the 76 Epistle: [d] *The Lord called his body the bread, compounded with the gathering together of many graines.*

We have a Treatise of the two natures of Christ, against *Nestorius* and *Eutyches*, made by Pope *Gelasius*, who wrote about the yeare of our Lord 495. There, is this sentence to be found, which vexeth and grieves mightily our Adversaries: [e] *Certainely the Sacraments that we take of the body & blood of Christ, are a divine thing, for which cause also by them we are made partakers of the divine nature, and yet the substance or nature of the bread and wine ceaseth not to be. And verily the Image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ, is celebrated in the action of the mysteries.* Note that hee disputed against the *Eutychians*, who held that the substance of the body of Christ was passed and changed into the substance of the divine nature. The controversy was not about the conversion of the

[c] *Vinum fuit quod sanguinem suũ dixit.*

[d] *Dominus corpus suũ panẽ vocat de multorũ granorum adunatione congestum.*

[e] *Certe Sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis & sanguinis Christi, divina res est: propter quod & per eadẽ divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ, & tamẽ esse non desinit substãtia panis & vini. Et certe imago & similitudo corporis & sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrãtur.*

the accidents, but of the Substance, which *Gelasius* maintaineth to remaine in the body of the Lord, as the substance of the bread remaineth in the Sacrament. Now, no man can doubt but that this Book be of *Gelasius* Bishop of *Rome*, seeing that *Fulgentius* who lived in *Gelasius* time, alleadgeth it * in his Book to *Ferrandus* the Deacon, in the 2 proposition: and attributeth it to the Pope *Gelasius*.

* *Hoc etiam beatæ memoriæ Papa Gelasius, &c. in eo libro quem memoratus Antistes conscripsit adversus eos qui in Domino Iesu duarum naturarum nolunt individuã credere veritatem.*

*Fulgentius*, Disciple to S. *Austin*, in his second Book to *Trasimondus*, chap. 17. a *How is Christ ascended into Heaven, but because he is in a place, and a man indeed? Or how is he present to his Faithfull ones, but because he is infinit and a God indeed?*

Again, in his Book of the Faith to *Peter* the *Deacon*, chap. 19. b *The holy Catholick Church which is over all the world now, that is to say under the New Testament, ceaseth not to offer unto Christ Jesus, with the Father and the holy Ghost with whom he is one and the same Godhead, a Sacrifice of bread and wine, in Faith and Charity. For in those carnall oblations* [of the Old Testament] *there was a figure of Christs*

a *Quomodo ascendit in cœlum, nisi quia localis et verus est homo? aut quomodo adest fidelibus fuit, nisi quia idem immensus est et verus deus?*

b *Cui nunc id est tempore novi Testamenti cum Patre et Sp. Sancto, cum quibus illi est una divinitas, sacrificium panis et vini in fide et charitate sanctæ Ecclesiæ Catholicæ per universum orbem terræ offerre non cessat, etc.*

flesh

*flesh, which he was to offer for our sins, being without sin. But in the sacrifice* [of the Eucharist] *is made an action of thankesgiving, and a remembrance of the flesh of Christ which he offered for us, and of the blood that himselfe, who is God, hath shed for us.* Besides this, that he calleth the Holy Supper a remembrance, and a Sacrifice of bread and wine: it is very remarkable that he saith, that this Sacrifice of bread and wine is offered unto Christ Jesus. Whereby it appeareth that this Sacrifice is not Christ himselfe: for Christ is not Sacrificed unto Christ.

*Facundus* an African Bishop, who wrote about the yeare of our Lord 550 in the defence of three heads or points of the Councell of *Chalcedon*: **The Sacrament of Adoption* [to wit Baptisme] *may be called the Adoption, even as we call the Sacrament of his body and blood which is in the bread and in the consecrated Cup, his body and blood: Not that, to speake properly, the bread is his body, and the Cup his blood: But because they containe in them the mystery of his body and blood.* This Book of *Facundus*, drawn out of the *Vatican* Library, was published by *Jacobus Sirmondus* a Jesuite, who for this cause was suspected. And I heare he hath been in trouble about it.

* *Potest Sacramentum adoptionis adoptionũ cupari, sicut Sacramentũ corporis & sanguinis ejus quod est in pane & poculo consecrato corpus ejus & sanguinẽ dicimus, nõ quod proprie corpus ejus sit panis, & poculum sanguis: sed quod in se mysterium corporis & sanguinis, continent, &c.*

a *Turrianus*

a Turrianus and *Vasquez*, and *Gregory of Valentia*, Jesuites, object unto themselves a place of *Chrysostome* in his Epistle to *Cesarius*: which Epistle also is in *Biblioth. Patr.* Printed at *Colen*, anno 1618 in the 8 Tome. That place is such: *Before the bread be sanctified, we call it bread: But the divine grace sanctifying it by the meanes of the Priest, it is freed indeed from the appellation of bread, and is honored with the name of the body of the Lord, though the nature of bread remaine in it.* These Iesuites answer that this place is not of *John Chrysostome*, but of another *John* of *Constantinople*. Which they say without proofe. Yet it matters not, for it sufficeth they acknowledge that place to be of an ancient Author.

The 8 Books of *Apostolicall Constitutions* attributed to *Clemens* the first, Bishop of *Rome*, are not of him: Nevertheless these Books are ancient, and there is much good to be learned in them. In the 5 Book, chap. 16. it is said, that b *Christ having given the figurative mysteries of his body and blood, went to the mount of Olivet.*

a Turrian. li. 1. de Eucharist. c. 18. §. Ad illud. Vasq. in 3. part. Thomæ Tomo 3. Dis. 180. c. 9 pag. 107. Greg. de Val. lib. de Transs. c. 7.

*Sicut enim antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus; divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediante Sacerdote, liberatus quidem est ab appellatione panis, & dignus habitus est Dominici corporis appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in eo remanserit.* b *Cum vero antitypa mysteria pretiosi Corporis & sanguinis sui nobis tradidisset.*

And

And in the 7 Book, chap. 26. [c] *We give thee thankes for the precious blood of Christ, which was shed for us, and for the precious body, whereof we performe the signes by his command, for to shew forth his death.*

There would never be an end if wee should gather up all the places of the ancient Fathers, wherein they say that that which we receive in the Eucharist is bread, and that the bread and wine are Signes, Symboles, Figures and Antitypes of the body and blood of the Lord: I will adde but two Canons of a Councell, which are very formall.

The 24 Canon of the III Councell of *Carthage* is such: [a] *Let nothing be offered in the sacred service but the body and blood of the Lord, (as also the Lord hath ordained it) that is to say, nothing but bread and wine mingled with water.* The same Canon is found repeated in the very same words in the Councell of *Trull*, in the Canon 32, aswell in the *Greeck* as in the *Latin* Copies. Upon which Canon, *Balsamon* maketh this Commentary: *The two and thirtieth Canon of the Councell of Trull hath*

[c] *Etiam agimus gratias tibi, Pater, pro pretioso sanguine Iesu Christi qui effusus est pro nobis, et pro pretioso corpore cujus hec Antitypa perficimus.*

[a] Ἵνα ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις μηδὲν πλέον τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου προσενεχθείη, ὡς καὶ κυρίος αὐτὸς παρέδοκε, τουτ' ἔστι ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου ὕδατι μεμιγμένου.

*ordained very at large,* [a] *that the non-bloody Sacrifice was made with bread and wine mingled with water, because that the bread is the figure of the body of the Lord, and the wine the figure of his blood.* Here is then above two hundred Bishops gathered in a Councell, that interpret these words, *the body and blood of Christ, by the bread and wine mingled with water.*

The same Councell in the 23 Canon ordaineth, that *when a man officiates at the Altar, the Prayer must always be directed to the Father.* Whence appeareth manifestly that then they worshipped not the Sacrament, seeing that the Councel forbiddeth when men assist at the Altar, to addresse their Prayers to Christ. If this hoste be Christ, it must be worshipped, and by consequent invocated.

And that it may appeare how lately this opinion of Transubstantiation was received: in the Tome *de Divinis officiis,* which is in *Biblioth. Patr.* we have an Epistle of that Great Emperor *Carolus Magnus,* where he saith, [b] *Christ supping with his Disciples, brake bread, and gave them likewise the Cup, in figure of his body and blood.* This Epistle happily might bee written about the yeare of our Lord 800.

[a] Γίνεσθαι τὴν ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν μετὰ ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου μεμιγμένου ὕδατι, ὡς τοῦ μὲν ἄρτου τύπον ἔχοντος τοῦ κυριακοῦ σώματος, τοῦ δὲ οἴνου τύπον τοῦ αἵματος.

[b] *Cum ad altare assistitur, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio.*

[c] *Christus cœnando cũ discipulis panem fregit, & calicem pariter eis dedit in figuram corporis & sanguinis sui.*

*Wale-*

*Walefridus Strabo*, who wrote about the yeare 850, in his Book of Ecclesiasticall things, chap. 16. [c] *The Lord, at the last Supper he made with his Disciples afore he was betrayed, after he had made an end of the solemnity of the ancient Passeover, gave to his Disciples the sacred signes of his body and blood in the SUBSTANCE of the bread and wine, and taught them to celebrate them in remembrance of his most holy Passion.*

*Rupertus* Abbot of *Deutsch*, neare *Colen*, who lived in the yeare 1112. and whose works are yet extant, hath condemned Transubstantiation, and taught that the Substance of bread remaineth after the Consecration. Here are his words upon the 12 chap. of *Exodus*: [d] *Even as Christ neither changed nor destroyed the humane nature, but joyned himselfe to it: So in the Sacrament he neither destroyeth nor changeth the substance of the bread and wine, but joyneth himselfe to it in the unity of his body and blood.* This place of *Rupertus* is alleadged by *Salmeron* in the 16 Treatise of the IX. Tome, §. *Ruit*, and *Bellarmin* in his Book of Ecclesiastical Writers, alleadgeth out of him many such like places, and blameth him for it.

To so many places that say, that the

[c] *In cœna quam ante traditionẽ suã ultimã cum discipulis habuit post Paschæ veteris solemnia corporis et sãguinis sui Sacramẽta in panis et vini substãtia eisdẽ discipulis suis tradidit, et ea in cõmemorationẽ sanctissimæ suæ passionis celebrare perdocuit*

[d] Rup. Tuitiensis in Exo. 12. *Sicut Christus humanã naturam nec mutavit, nec destruxit, sed assumpsit, ita in Sacramẽto, nec destruit, nec mutat substantiã panis & vini, sed assumit in unitatem corporis et sanguinis sui.*

ſubſtance of the bread remaineth after the Conſecration, our Adverſaries do reply, that by the word of *Subſtance*, the Fathers underſtand the *Accidents*. As it is a great abſurdity by the word of *Accidents*, to underſtand the Subſtance: So is it as great an abſurdity by the word of *Subſtance* to underſtand Accidents. If it may be lawfull for them to wreſt the Fathers thus, and when they ſay a thing is white, underſtand that they mean black: never will there be any thing cleare, nor ſure. Certainely, if by this word Subſtance, the Fathers had underſtood the Accidents, they would have ſaid the *Subſtances* in the plurall. For Accidents are many: Among which our Adverſaries muſt chuſe one, that may be called Subſtance. But *Theodoret* in his ſecond Dialogue, ſaying that *the bread after the Conſecration remaineth in its former ſubſtance, forme, and figure*, refuteth this evaſion. For hee diſtinguiſheth expreſſely the Subſtance from the Accidents.

Now, as this error of the bodily preſence of Chriſts body under the *ſpecies* of the bread, began to be ſet on broach: *Bertram* a Prieſt, in *Charles* the *Bald* his time, about the yeare of our Lord 870. made

made a Book against that abuse, which Book is yet extant. For which cause also *Bellarmin* in his first Book of the Eucharist, chap. 1. placeth him among the Hereticks. But *Bertram*, all his life time, lived with credit and honor, and was never reprooved for it.

## CHAP. XXVII.

### *Confirmation of the same, by the customes of the ancient Church.*

THis truth is confirmed by the ancient customes different from what is done in the Masse at this day, and incompatible with Transubstantiation. For in the ancient Church, Service was said in a known tongue. Every one received the Communion in both kinds.

The people offered upon the table abundance of bread and wine, and not round & light wafers. * The people, as well men as women, received the Sacrament with their hand, and many carried

* Cypr. Serm. de Lapsis. Euseb. Histor. lib. 7. c. 9. Theod. Histor. lib. 5. cap. 18. Nazianz. Orat. de Gorgonia.

it home a long with them. * The resi-
dues of the sacred bread that remained
upon the table after the Communion,
were either burn't, or [a] given unto little
children coming from Schoole, or carried
into the Priests houses, for to be eaten
there. Than were there no private Mas-
ses. Nor no *Corpus Christi* day. The
consecrated Host was not carried in pro-
cession. * *Ambrose* in his Book of Wid-
dows, saith that the Widdowes were
imployed in the administration of
the Sacrament. [a] In the Roman
Order which is in *Bibliotheca Patrum*,
these words are to be found: *Let the Vir-
gin receive the Communion after the Masse is
ended, and after she hath received, let her re-
serve of the Communion sufficiently for to
communicate eight dayes together.* Had they
then beleeved the Transubstantiation,
they would never have given unto maids
the Sacrament to keep so long a time.

Certain it is the ancient Church wor-
shipped not the Sacrament. There may
be found indeed some places of the Fa-
thers that say that in the Eucharist wee
worship Christ: But it is one thing to
worship Christ in the action of the Sa-
crament, and another thing to worship

* Hesychius lib. 2. in Lev. c. 8. Ivo 2 part. 2 de Sacr. c. 59. Burch. l. 5. c. 12.

* Evagr. l. 4 cap. 36.

* Amb. l. de Viduis. Oportet eam [*Viduam*] primo carere variarum illecebris voluptatũ, vitare internum corporis animiq; lãguorẽ, ut corpus & sanguinem Christi ministret.

[a] Editionis Parisiensis anno 1624 colũ. 167. *Virgo postquã cõmunicavit, reservet de ipsa cõmunione unde usque ad diem octavum communicet.*

the

the Sacrament. The Father and the holy Ghost in the Eucharist are also worshipped.

In vaine do they alleadge some ancient Fathers that speak of the elevation of the Sacrament. For the elevation inferreth not necessarily adoration: seeing that in *Moses* Law the Priest* waved the breast and shoulder of the offering, and a handfull of the first fruits, without worshipping these things. Moreover, that elevation was nothing like to the elevation of the Host which the Priest maketh now a dayes over his head, turning his back to the people, and ringing a little Bell. But then after the Priest had uncovered the bread and wine, he tooke the Platter or Dish with both his hands, and lift it up for to shew it unto the people, and that even before the words which are called of Consecration.

* Exod. 29. 24. Levitic. 8. 27. & 29. Num. 5. 25

## CHAP. XXVIII.

## CHA. XXVIII.

*Explanation of the places of the Fathers that say that in the Eucharist we eate the body and blood of Christ, and that the bread is changed into the body of Christ, and is made Christs body. Specially of Ambrose, Hilary, and Chrysostome. That the Fathers speake of severall kinds of body and blood of Christ.*

THe holy Scripture speaketh of two sorts of body of Christ. Namely, of the natural body of Christ, which he took in the womb of the *Virgin Mary*, and of his mysticall body, wch is the Church, and of his Sacramentall or commemorative body, which is the bread of the holy Supper: as we have shewed already.

The Fathers following the stile of the Scripture, besides Christs mysticall body which is the Church, speak of two bodies of Christ, to wit, of his naturall body, and of his Symbolicall and Sacramentall body:

body: of which body they speak as of a divine thing and full of Mysteries: and of a Spirituall flesh, which is made by the ineffable power of God, by the meanes and for the causes which I shall relate hereafter. Likewise also they make two kinds of blood of Christ; the one naturall, the other mysticall and Divine, which we receive in the Sacrament.

*Clement Alexandrinus* in his second Book of the *Pedagogue*, chap. 2.* *There is two sorts of blood of Christ, the one is his carnall blood by which we are redeemed from corruption. The other is Spirituall, to wit, that by which we are annointed: and that is to drink the blood of Jesus, to be partaker of the Lords incorruption.*

Saint *Hierome* upon the Epistle to the Ephesians: [a] *Christs flesh is meant or understood in two manners, either that spirituall and divine flesh of which hee saith himselfe, My flesh is meate indeed. Or else that flesh that was crucified, and that blood which was shed by the speare of the Souldier.* This place is alleadged in the Roman *Decree* in the second Distinction of the Consecration, at the Canon *Dupliciter*.

And in the same Distinction at the Canon

* Διττὸν αἷμα τοῦ κυρίου, τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐστιν αὐτοῦ σαρκικὸν ᾧ τῆς φθορᾶς λελυτρώμεθα. τὸ δὲ πνευματικόν.

[a] Ex Hieron. in Epist. ad Ephes. ca. 1. Dist. 2. de Conse. Can. Dupliciter. *Dupliciter intelligitur caro Christi vel spiritualis illa atque divina de qua ipse ait, Caro mea vere est cibus, vel caro quæ crucifixa est, & sanguinis qui militis effusus est lanceâ.*

Canon [b] *De hoc*, the same Father is alleadged upon *Leviticus*, in these words. *It is indeed lawfull to eate of this hoste, which is made admirably in remembrance of Christ. But it is not lawfull in it selfe for any one to eate of that which he offered on the Altar of the Crosse.*

[b] *De hac quidem hostia, quæ in commemorationem mirabiliter fit, edere licet. De illa vero quam Christus in ara crucis obtulit secundùm se nulli edere licet.*

And in the same place, at the Canon *Corpus*, taken out of Saint *Austin*: [c] *We doe call body and blood of Christ, that which being taken of the fruits of the earth, is consecrated by the mysticall prayer.* Certainely, a body of Christ taken of the fruits of the earth, is not the body of Christ crucified for us.

[c] *Corpus & sanguinem Christi dicimus illud quod de fructibus terræ acceptum & precè mystica consecratum, &c.*

*Tertullian* in the sixth chapter of his Booke of Prayer: [d] *The bread is the word of the living God which is descended from heaven.* Item *the body that is holden to be in the bread: This is my body.*

*Eusebius* of *Cesarea* in his third Booke of Eccleſiaſticall Divinitie, Chapter 12. [e] *The Lord spake not of the flesh which hee tooke, but of his mysticall body and blood.*

Saint *Austin* calleth very often that which we receive in the holy Supper,

[d] *Panis est Sermo Dei vivi, qui descendit de cælis. Tum quod & corpus ejus in pane censetur. Hoc est corpus meum.* [e] Οὐ περὶ τῆς ἀναλήπτου σαρκὸς ἐλάλησεν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ μυστικοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος.

the

the body of Christ. But that we may not thinke that that which we receive by the corporall mouth is that body of the Lord which was crucified for us, he bringeth in Christ saying unto us, *Ye shall not eate this body that you see, and shall not drinke the blood shed by those that shall crucifie me. What then? I have* (saith he) *recommended a Sacrament unto you, which being taken Spiritually, shall quicken and vivifie you.*

*In Psal. 98. Non hoc corpus quod videturis manducaturi estis, neq; bibituri illud sanguinem quē fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent, Sacramentum aliquod vobis cōmendavi, spiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos.*

Saint *Ambrose* in his Commentarie upon Saint *Luke*, maketh a plaine difference betweene these two kinds of body of Christ, expounding the words of the Lord, *Luke* 17. *Wheresoever the bodie is, thither will the Eagles bee gathered together.* First he saith that by the body may be vnderstood the dead body of Christ, and by the Eagles which are about it, *Mary* wife to *Cleophas*, and *Mary Magdalen*, and *Mary* mother of the Lord: then he addeth, *There is also that body of whom it is said, My flesh is meate indeed.*

Pope *Innocent* the third in the fourth Booke of the Mysteries of the Masse, Chapter 36. distinguisheth in expresse termes these two kindes of flesh or body of Christ, saying, *The forme of the bread*

*bread comprehendeth both the one and the other flesh of Christ, to wit, the true, and the mysticall.*

*Salmeron* the Jesuite in his fifteenth Treatise of the IX Tome, gathereth the same distinction of two sorts of blood of Christ, out of the Booke of the Lords Supper attributed to Saint *Cyprian*. *Why* (saith he) *in the Law it was forbidden to eate blood, and it is commanded in the Gospell: Cyprian teacheth it excellently well in his Booke of the Lords Supper. For in the abstinence of that blood is designed the Spirituall and reasonable life, farre from brutish manners.* [b] *Now we drinke of Christs blood, both of that which is humane, and of that which is divine. To the end we may understand that in tasting of him we are called to the participation of eternall and divine life.*

[b] *Bibimus verò de Christi sanguine humano pariter ac divino, ut intelligamus per ejus gustum ad æterna ac divinæ vitæ participium nos vocatos.*

Wee have in the former Chapter alleadged *Euphremius* calling the bread of the Eucharist *the body* of Christ, and yet saying that *that body loseth not the Substance of bread.* And the Canon *Hoc est* in the second Distinction of the Consecration, drawne out of Saint *Austin*, saying, that *the bread which is the flesh of Christ, is after its manner called the body of Christ, though indeed it is the sacred*

ced signe of the body of Christ. And Saint Justin, *The Lord made no difficultie to say, This is my body, when hee gave the signe of his body.* And *Theodoret* likewise, saying, *The Lord hath given to the signe the name of his body.* And *Origen*, calling the bread of the Supper *a figurative body of Christ.*

[c] *Dominus corpus suũ panẽ vocat de multorũ granorum adunatione congestum.*

The same appeareth more cleare than the very day, in that the Fathers which say that in the Eucharist we eate Christs body, attribute unto this body things which cannot agree with the naturall body of Christ borne of the Virgin *Mary*, and crucified for us. Saint *Cyprian* [c] in his 76 Epistle saith: *The Lord calleth the bread his body which is made and composed of many graines.* And in the 63 Epistle, [d] *The Lords body cannot be of the flower alone, or of the water alone, except both the one and the other be kneaded and conjoyned together.* Certainely, this body of Christ composed of many graines and kneaded with water, cannot be the body of Christ crucified for us.

[d] *Nec corpus Domini potest esse farina sola, aut aqua sola, nisi utrumque adunatum fuerit, &c.*

*Justin* in his second Apologie, saith: [e] *The Deacons doe give to every one of those that are present to participate, bread and wine and water, whereupon thankesgivings have beene said.* Then he addeth, *that this bread*

[e] Οἱ καλού-μενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τ' εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος.

bread is the body of Christ. But he sheweth manifestly that this bodie of Christ, is not that which was crucified for us, in that he saith *it is a meate wherewith our flesh and blood are fed by the transmutation.* He speaketh of the change made by the disgestion. For our bodies are not fed of, or with the body crucified for us, that bodie is not changed into our flesh and blood. For, that *Justin* beleeved not the Transubstantiation, he sheweth it sufficiently in the Dialogue against *Tryphonius*, saying, b *The oblation of fine flower was a figure of the bread of the Eucharist, which our Lord Jesus hath ordained to be made in remembrance of his Passion.*

a Τροφην ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σὰρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν.

b Ἡ τοῦ σεμιδάλεως, &c. Τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους, &c.

*Irenæus* in his first Booke saith the same, c *The Lord hath affirmed that the Cup, which is a creature wherewith bee maketh our bodyes grow, is his bodie.* Would *Irenæus* have lost his wit so farre, as to beleeve that our bodies grow and are fed with the crucified body of the Lord, and with the blood shedde upon the Crosse, which did not returne into his body?

c *Eum calicem, qui est creatura, suum corpus confirmavit ex quo nostra auget corpora.*

The same distinction of two sorts of body of Christ, in the writings of the ancient Fathers, appeareth in that they

they doe speake of the peeces of the bodie of Christ, and of the residues of the body of Christ that remaine after the Communion: Which cannot agree with Christs naturall body crucified for us, that cannot be broken in peeces, and whereof there can be no residue. Pope *Gelasius* in the Canon *Comperimus*, second Distinction of the Consecration. [d] *We have learned that some having taken one part of the body of Christ, abstaine from the cup*, which thing he calleth a sacriledge. And *Evagrius* the Historian in his fourth Booke, Chapter 36. [e] *The ancient custome of the royall City requireth, that when many Peeces of the immaculate body of Christ remaine, children not yet in age to be corrupted, going to Schoole, be called for to eate them.* How could one give peeces of the naturall bodie of Christ, who sitteth at the right hand of God? What likelihood is there to give to a troope of little children the residues of the body of Christ? Would not that bee esteemed at this day in the *Romane* Church, an horrible profanation?

[d] *Comperimus quod quidam sumpta tãtum modo corporis sacri portione à calice sacrati cruoris abstineant.*

[e] Εθος παλαιὸν βούλεται ἀνὰ τὴν βασιλεύουσαν, ὅτ' ἂν πολύ τι χρῆμα τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ ἀχράντου σώματος Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐνεὐπόμενοι, παῖδας ἀφθόρους μεταπεμπτοὺς γίνεσθαι περὶ τὴν ἐς χαμαὶ διδασκάλους φοιτῶντων, καὶ ταῦτα κατεσθίειν.

Where.

Wherefore it is a thing very frequent in the Fathers to say, that *Panis est Corpus Christi*, The bread *is Christs body*. And we have heard Saint *Austin* here above speake so. Words, which if they were taken or understood of the naturall body of Christ, would be false. For the bread is not the body that was crucified for us.

It is therefore unjustly done by our Adversaries to expose unto the View, with great noyse and rumour, some places out of the Bookes of Sacraments attributed to Saint *Ambrose*, and out of the Booke of the Lords Supper attributed to *Cyprian*, wherein is sayde that the bread, after the words of Consecration becometh and is made Christs bodie: since we doe shew by so many proofes that they speake of another body than of that which was borne of the Virgin *Marie*, and that was crucified, as we will shew yet more clearely hereafter.

For, that the Author of these Bookes attributed to Saint *Ambrose*, hath believed that after the Consecration the bread is bread still: he shewes it plainly when he saith, [c]*Let us therefore establish this, to wit, how that which is bread, may*

[c] Lib. 4. de Sacramẽt. cap. 4.

be Christs body. And a little after, *If there be such power and vertue in the word of the Lord Jesus, as to make that things which were not, begin to bee: how much more shall he make that the things which were, be, and be changed into other things?* This excellent place, which saith that the things which were, are still, that is to say, that that which was bread, is bread still, is found thus alleadged by *Lombard*, in his fourth Booke of *Sentences*, Distinction 10. And by *Thomas* in the third part of his Summe, question 78. Art. 4. And by *Gratian* in the second Distinction of the Consecration at the Canon *Panis est*; And by [b] *Gabriel Biel*, and *Alger*, and *Ivo Carnutensis*, and *Jodocus Coccius*: and not according to the new editions of *Ambrose*, in which these words, *Sint quæ erant*, are left out. Such falsifications are frequent in the new editions.

[a] *Si tanta vis in Sermone Domini Iesu, ut inciperent esse quæ nõ erant, quãto magis operatorius est ut sint quæ erant, et in aliud commutentur.*

[b] *Gabr. lect. 40. in Can. Missæ Alger. de Sacram. corp. lib. 2. cap. 7 Ivo cap. 2. Parte. cap. 7. Et Iodocus Coccius Tom. 2. lib. 6. pag. 621.*

Some places may bee found indeed wherein some Fathers say, that the bread of the Eucharist is the body of the Lord crucified for us. But that must be understood after the same manner as Christ said of the bread that it was his body, and that the Cup is the New Testament, because it is the Sacrament or remembrance of it.

They doe object a place of Saint *Hilarie* out of his eighth Booke of the *Trinitie*, where he saith, [a] *Of the truth of the flesh and blood, there is no doubt. For at this day, both by the profession of the Lord and by our Faith, it is flesh indeed, and blood indeed; and these things taken and swallowed downe, cause vs to be in Christ and Christ in us.*

First of all it is a great abuse to urge Saint *Hilary*, who in this point of the nature of Christs body had an errour that destroyes the whole Christian Religion: For [b] he teacheth that Christ in his Passion suffered no manner of paine at all, and that the stripes they gave him, were as if they had pierced the aire or the fire with a dart. Secondly, it appeareth that *Hilary* speaketh of the Spirituall manducation. For by it alone are we in Christ, and Christ in us. Thirdly, when *Hilarie* saith there remaineth no place to doubt of the truth of the flesh and blood of the Lord; he doth not meane it must not be doubted but that in the Eucharist we eate truely

[a] *De veritate carnis & sanguinis nō relictus est ambigendi locus. Nunc enim & ipsius Dōni professione, & fide nostra vere caro est & vere sanguis. Et hæc accepta atq; hausta efficiunt ut & nos in Christo & Christus in nobis sit.*

[b] *Hilar. lib. 10. de Trinitate In quem quamvis aut ictus incideret, aut vulnus descenderet &c. afferunt quidē hæc impetū passionis, non tamen dolorē passionis inferrent, ut telū aliquod aut aquam perforans, aut ignem compungens, aut aëra vulnerans.* Et paulo post, *Virtus corporis sine sensu pœnæ vim pœnæ in se desæviētis excepit.*

the

the naturall flesh of Christ by the mouth of the body: But he saith that we must not doubt but Christ had a true flesh and a true blood: For he disputeth against certaine Hereticks that destroyed the truth of his human nature.

For as touching the *Mystagogicall Catecheses* attributed to *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, which are objected against us, where it is sayd that we must not beleeve our senses telling us that it is bread: it is certaine that those *Catecheses* are supposed and falsly attributed to *Cyril*. For the Stile of them is very different from those 18 *Catecheses* of *Cyril* that precedes them, which are cited by *Theodoret*, and by *Gelasius*, and by *Damascen*: but these last are never alleadged by any one. In the first *Catechese*, there is an evident marke of falsity. For hee disswadeth his hearers from frequenting the Amphitheater where the Gladiators chases and combates were made against wild beasts, and the *Hippodromus* or *Circus*, that is to say the Parke or Place where horses races and combates were exercised. For then were no such buildings nor spectacles in *Jerusalem*, nor never were any since *Jerusalem* was Christian.

Πόμπη διαβόλου θεατρομανίαι καὶ ἱπποδρομίαι κυνηγεσία, &c.

And concerning *Chrysostomes* hyperbolical amplifications, saying that the Altar streames with blood, that wee fasten our teeth in his flesh, that wee put our fingers in his wounds and suck the blood of them, and that a Seraphin bringeth unto us a burning coale with a paire of tongs, they bee outlashing words that savour of a declamation, and which our Adversaries themselves doe not beleeve.

## CHAP. XXIX.

### *That divers Ancient Fathers have beleeved a mysticall Union of the Godhead of Christ with the bread of the Sacrament.*

NEvertheless, I cannot deny but that many Fathers have had an opinion, which with good reason is rejected by the Roman Church of these dayes. They teach that as Christs divine nature hath united it selfe personally unto his humane nature, so the same divine nature,

by vertue of the Consecration, is united to the bread of the Eucharist, by an union, though not personall and hypostaticall, yet mysticall, divine, and ineffable, by which the bread remaining bread, is made the body of Christ. For they use this comparison, taken from the personall union of the two natures of Christ, for to shew how the bread is the body of Christ: This opinion hath no foundation in the Scripture. Yet I dare say, it is an errour no way prejudiciall to Christian Religion. For that opinion changeth not the nature of Christ, and destroyes not his humanitie. Neither doth it destroy the nature of the Sacrament, since they did beleeve that the bread changeth not its substance. Whence also they worshipped not the Sacrament, neither did fall into Idolatrie. To be short, it was an innocent error, serving to augment and encrease the peoples respect and reverence to the holie Sacrament, which for that cause they call terrible and wonderfull.

In the meane while we have in that a most evident proofe that these Fathers did not beleeve the Transubstantiation. For as they beleeved not that by the u-

nion of Christs divinitie with his humanitie, the human nature was transubstantiated, or his bodie abolished: so that not they beleeve that by this mysticall and divine union of the God-head of Christ with the bread, the bread should be destroyed, and turned into another substance.

By this doctrine the bread of the Eucharist is the body of Christ in two manners: the one because of that mysticall union of the bread with Christ, after the same sorte as Jesus Christ man is called the Son of God; because of the personall union with the Sonne of God: The other, because this bread is the sacred signe and remembrance of Christs body, as it is usual to give to the signes the name of that which they doe signifie. For this second consideration they say that the bread of the Eucharist is the body which was borne of the Virgin, and crucified for us. For as touching the first Consideration, it is certaine that this bread which they say is made Christs body by that mysticall union, is another body of Christ than that which was crucified for us. For to effect such a transmutation, they interpose the Omnipotencie of God. For it must bee a

divine

divine power for to cause that the bread remaining bread, bee so straitly united to the Godhead of Christ, as to become the body of Christ.

Now, that these Fathers doe hold that this mysticall body of Christ is another body than that which was crucified for us, though it be the same in signification, we prooved it just now by a multitude of places of Fathers, wherein they say that Christ hath two sorts of flesh, and that we may very well eate of that flesh or mysticall body which is taken in the Sacrament, but no manner of way eate the flesh that was crucified for us.

The first Father that ever made use of the personall union of the two natures of Christ for to shew how the bread is made the body of Christ, not by Transubstantiation, but by the mysterious union of the Godhead of Christ with the bread, is *Justin Martyr*, about the end of his second Apologie, where he speaketh thus: *Wee doe not take these things as common bread: but after the same manner as Christ our Saviour was incarnate and made flesh and blood for our salvation, so we have beene taught that the meate wherein thankesgivings have been*

*rendred by the prayer of the Word, where by our flesh is nourished by* [a] *transmutation, is the body and blood of Christ Jesus.* Now that *Justin* beleeved that this meate is bread still, and hath not lost its substance, he sheweth it when hee saith that our bodies are fed with it. And by that which he saith in that very place, that *the Deacons give to all them that are present to participate, the bread and wine, whereupon graces have beene said.*

The Author likewise of the Catechisticall prayer attributed to *Gregory* of *Nysse*, useth the same comparison: [b] *The body* (saith he) *is changed into a divine dignity by the inhabitation of the Word God. With good reason then also now I beleeve that the bread, sanctified by the word of God, is changed into the body of God the Word.* If this comparison be good, as the body of Christ was not transubstantiated by the inhabitation of the Godhead: no more likewise is the bread transubstantiated by the consecration which is made at the Sacrament.

*Hilary* speaketh just so in the eighth Booke of the Trinity: [c] *If the Word was*

[a] By this transmutation hee understandeth the change of the bread which is made in the stoach for the nourishment of our bodies.

[b] I shew this falsity in my book against Cardinall *du Perron*, lib. 7. cap. 22. Namely in that he speaks of one *Severus*, an Heritick, wch came above a hundred yeares after the death of this *Gregory*.

[c] *Si vere Verbum caro factum est, & non Verbum carnem cibo Dominico sumimus.*

truly

*truly made flesh, and wee also in the meate of the Lord doe take the Word flesh.*

*Gratian* in his second distinction of the Consecration, [d] alleadgeth a place of *Austin*, drawne from the Sentences of *Prosper*, in these words, *The Sacrifice of the Church is composed of two things, to wit of the Sacrament, and of the thing of the Sacrament; that is to say of the body of Christ, after the same manner as Christs person is composed of God and man. For Christ is very God and very man.*

*Ireneus* hath an opinion by himselfe. For he saith [e] that the bread is the body of Christ, because Christ is the Creator of all things, esteeming that the whole world in respect of God, is what the body of man is to his Soule. Which was the opinion and beleife of *Plato*, of *Cicero*, of *Virgil*, and of all the *Platonick* Schoole, that bore the sway in *Ireneus* his time.

Such was the beleife of the Author of the Booke of the Lords supper, attributed to Saint *Cyprian*. That Author speaketh thus: [f] *The common bread being*

[d] Can. hoc est. *Hoc est quod dicimus, &c. Sicut Christi persona constat ex Deo & homine, cum ipse Christus verus sit Deus & verus sit homo.*

[e] *Quomodo constabit eis eum panem in quo gratiæ actæ sunt, corpus esse Domini sui & calicem sanguinem ejus, si non ipsum fabricatoris mũdi filium dicunt. i. verbum ejus, per quod lignũ fructificat, defluunt fontes, & dat terra primo quidem fœnum deinde spicas.*

[f] *Panis ste communis in carnem & sanguinem mutatus, procurat vitam & incrementum corporibus, ideoq; ex consueto rerum effectu fidei nostræ adjuta infirmitas sensibili argumento, edocta est visibilibus Sacramentis inesse vitæ æternæ effectum.*

changed

*changed into flesh, and into blood, bringeth life and growth unto the body. And therefore the infirmity of our flesh being helped by the accustomed effect, is taught by a sensible proofe, that in the visible Sacrament there is an effect of eternall life.* When he saith that the common bread is turned into flesh, and into blood, he doth not meane that it is turned into the flesh and blood of Christ, but into our flesh and blood by disgestion; for hee addeth that this bread nourisheth our bodyes and maketh them to grow; and all the currant of the speech sheweth that. But a little after hee addeth some wordes whereupon our Adversaries doe triumph and glory, for lack of understanding what this Authors beleefe was. * *The bread* (saith hee) *that the Lord gave to his Disciples, being changed, not in shew, but in nature, is made flesh by the omnipotency of the Word.* But in the words following, he sheweth that this conversion of the bread into the flesh of Christ, is made, not by Transubstantiation, but by an union of the Godhead of Christ with the bread, like unto the union of Christs divine nature with his humane nature: For he added immediatly after, *And even as in the*

* *Panis quē Dominus discipulis porrigebat, non effigie, sed natura mutatus omnipotentia Verbi factus est caro. Et sicut in persona Christi humanitas videbatur, et latebat divinitas, ita Sacramento visibili ineffabiliter divina se infudit essentia.*

*the person of Christ, his humanity was seene, but his divinity was hidden, so the divine essence is infused in the visible Sacrament by an unspeakable manner.* There is nothing more expresse, nor more contrary unto Transubstantiation. For according to this Authors beleefe, even as Christs divine nature did not transubstantiate his Manhood, but made it to be the flesh of the Son of God: So the divine Essence which he saith to be infused in the bread of the Sacrament, maketh it to become Christs body, without being Transubstantiated. Wherefore a little after, he saith, that that which we receive in the Sacrament, * *is unleavened bread, which sanctifieth us by touching it*: acknowledging that it is bread still.

* *Panis ita accipitur, hic azymus, cibus verus & sincerus per speciem & Sacramentum nos tactu sanctificat.*

*Bellarmin* in the 15 chap. of his third Book of the Eucharist, alleadgeth Saint *Remigius*, that wrote about the yeare of our Lord 520 in these words, a *The flesh which the Word of God the Father tooke in the Virgins wombe in unity of person, and the bread that is consecrated in the Church, are one and the selfe-same body. For the plenitude of the divinity which was in that flesh, filleth also this bread.* *Bellarmin* addeth that *Haimo* held the same language, and that *Gelasius* and *Theodorets* words that we have alleadged.

a *Caro quæ Verbū Dei Patris assumpsit in utero virginali unitate suæ personæ, et panis qui consecratur in Ecclesia, unum corpus sunt. Divinitatis enim plenitudo quæ fuit in illa, replet istum panem.*

alleadged above, may be fitted to this opinion.

The Author our Adversaries alleadge with more ostentation, is *Damascene*, whom they rank among the Saints. This man may be tearmed the *Lombard* of the *Grecians*, because he is the first among the *Grecians* that handled divinity in Philosophicall tearmes: And is the first that wrote for the adoration of Images. Now, he did write about the yeare of our Lord 740. This man in his 4 Book of the Orthodox Faith, chap. 14. extendeth himselfe upon this matter, and will have the bread [b] *to be changed into the body of the Lord*, not by transubstantiation, but by [c] *Assumption* and union with the divinity, like unto the union of Christs divinity with his humanity. *Because* (saith hee) [d] *that it is the custome to eate bread, and to drink wine and water, the Lord hath conjoyned his divinity to these things, and hath made them to be his body and blood.* And a little after, [e] *If thou inquirest in what*

[b] Μεταποιεῖσθαι.
[c] Παραλαμβάνεται.
[d] Ἐπειδὴ ἔθος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἄρτον ἐσθίειν, ὕδωρ τε καὶ οἶνον πίνειν συνέζευξεν αὐτοῖς τὴν αὐτοῦ θεότητα, καὶ πεποίηκεν αὐτὰ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα αὐτοῦ. [e] Εἰ δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἐπιζητεῖς πῶς γίνεται, ἀρκεῖ σοι ἀκοῦσαι ὅτι διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἑαυτῷ καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὁ κύριος σάρκα κατεστήσατο.

*manner that is done, let it suffice thee to understand that it is done by the holy Spirit, after the same manner as the Lord hath made himselfe to himselfe and in himselfe, a flesh taken of the holy Mother of God by the holy Ghost.* And a little after, he saith that the bread and wine [c] *is the body of Christ Deified.* Chiefly he is very expresse in that he addeth: [d] *The bread of the Communion is not meere bread, but it is conjoyned to the Divinity.* But still he acknowledgeth that it is bread, saying, the bread is the body of Christ, and calling it *the bread of the Communion*: And a little after, *The loaves of proposition did figurate this bread.* Item, *The bread is the first fruits of the future bread.* And a little after, *We partake all of one bread.* Only he hath this of particular to himselfe, that he will not have the bread to bee called the figure of Christs body, rejecting that kind of speech, usuall and ordinary in the Fathers that have written afore him.

It appeareth likewise in that he will have the Sacrament to bee honored, but not to be worshipped. [d] *Let us* (saith he) *honor it with purity corporall and spiritual*; and will have it to be received with the hands set in forme of a Crosse. For then

[c] Τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου τεθεωμένον

[d] Ἄρτος τῆς κοινωνίας οὐκ ἄρτος λιτὸς ἐστιν ἀλλ' ἡνωμένος θεότητι.

[d] Τιμήσωμεν δὲ αὐτὸ πάσῃ καθαρότητι ψυχικῇ τε καὶ σωματικῇ.

then it was not as yet the custom to chop it into the mouths of Communicants.

*Rupertus* was imbrued with the same opinion, *Even as Christ* (saith he) *did neither change nor destroy the humane nature, but joyned himself unto it: So in the Sacrament he neither destroyeth nor changeth the substance of the bread and wine, but joyneth himself unto it in the unity of his body and blood.* For which cause also *Bellarmin* placeth him among the Impanators.

This doctrine doth no whit agree with the ubiquity. For they did put this union of Christ with the bread, in the Sacrament only, which bringeth no manner of change to the naturall body of Christ. But these Fathers make two bodies of Christ: the one his naturall body, which is but in Heaven, the other the bread of the Sacrament, which they make to be Christs body two manner of wayes: to wit because it is united to the divinitie of Christ by an union like unto the hypostaticall union of the two natures of Christ, and because it is a signe, figure, and symbole of Christs naturall body: according as the signes are wont to be called by the name of that which they doe signifie and represent. Whence also

*Rupertus Tuitiensis in Exod. 12. Sicut Christus humanam naturã nec mutavit, nec destruxit, sed assumpsit, ita in Sacramento, nec destruit, nec mutat substantiam panis et vini, sed assumit in unitatem corporis et sanguinis sui.*

also they say sometimes that that bread is the body of Christ, borne of the Virgin, and crucified for us.

Whosoever shall apprehend this aright, shall have a key in their hand for to enter into the knowledge and intelligence of the Fathers, and for to come out of all difficulties. It is the solution of the places of *Cyril* that are objected against us, and of those and *Ambrose* out of the Booke of Sacraments. For indeed the Author of the Books of Sacraments was one of these Impanators, since that he holdeth that by the unspeakable vertue of God, the bread becometh the body of Christ, and yet remaines bread still, as we have prooved, and alleadged the forme of the service of that time, where it was said, * *That the oblation we offer, is the Figure of the body of Christ.* And in the 4 chap, *Let us establish this, to wit, how* THAT WHICH IS BREAD, *may be the body of Christ.* And a little after, he saith that the bread and the wine are still what they were, and yet are changed into the body and blood of the Lord. Wee must not wonder if for to work this change in the bread of the Sacrament, he imployeth the Omnipotency of God, and his unexpressable vertue in

* Ambros. li. 4. de Sacram. c. 5. *Fac nobis hanc oblationem ascriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis Christi.*

in changing things. For indeed if that union he conceiveth, were true, it were an unspeakable and incomprehensible work and wherein humane reason is stark blind.

Because of this mysticall union which is neare unto the personall union, *Cyrill* of *Alexandria* saith, that this body of Christ received into our bodies, maketh them susceptible and capable of the Resurrection. Which truely is an abuse. For by the same reason the participation of the Sacrament should keep us from dying. The Faithfull of the Old Testament, and *Iohn* the Baptiste, and the *Theefe* crucified with Christ, and an infinite number of Martyrs, that were never partakers of this Sacrament, are no lesse capable of the Resurrection.

From that impanation sprung up that custome by which in old time many particular persons carried away the Eucharist into their own houses, and kept it locked up in a chest or cupboord, as [a] *Gorgonia* did, who was sister to *Gregory Nazianzen*. Which sheweth on the one side that they did give unto that bread something more than to be the figure and signe of Christ body. And on the other side

[a] Gregor. Nazianz. *Oratione de sorore Gorgonia.*

side that sheweth also that they did not beleeve the Transubstantiation. For they would never have put Christs naturall body into a womans hand, for to keep it locked up in a cupboord.

From the same opinion proceeded that which *Satyrus* [b] did, who was S. *Ambroses* brother, and yet unbaptized. Who being upon the Sea in danger of shipwrack, caused the Eucharist to be given him, and hanged it about his neck, and then threw himselfe into the sea, for to save himselfe by swimming. An evident proofe they beleeved that in this Sacrament there was some secret vertue, and that nevertheless they beleeved not this bread to be the naturall body of Christ, crucified for us. For they would never have given it to an unbaptized person for to hang it about his neck, and cast it with him into the Sea.

[b] Ambros. *Oratione de obitu fratris Satyri.*

Neither is it to bee omitted that the Fathers never speake of the *species* of the bread in the plurall, but only in the singular, because that by the *species of the bread*, they understand the substance of the bread, which is one. But our Adversaries, which deprave the Fathers termes as well as their doctrine, speak of *species* of the bread in the plurall, be-

cause that by the *species* of the bread, they understand accidents without a subject, which are many. Which is a new doctrine, and a phrase or kind of speech altogether unusuall, not only in Philosophers, but also in the Fathers, and in all Antiquity.

## CHAP. XXX.

### *Particular opinion of Saint Austen and of Fulgentius, and of Innocent the third.*

*Austen*, and *Fulgentius* his disciple, take sometimes these words, *This is my body*, in a sense particular to themselves. For besides this exposition which is very frequent in S. *Austin*, namely, that the Lord called the bread his body, because it is the figure and signe of his body: in some places he will have in these words *THIS is my body*, that by this word, body, the Church be understood. For in his Sermon to Children, which is to be found at the end of *Fulgentius* his Workes, hee speaketh thus:

thus: *Those things are called Sacraments, because in them one thing is seene, and another understood, &c. If then thou wilt know what the body of Christ is, heare the Apostle saying, Ye are the body and members of Christ.* And in the 26 Treatise upon S. *John*, *By this meat, and by this drinke, the Lord will have the fellowship of his body and of his members to bee understood, to wit, the holy Church of the Predestinat.*

Pope *Innocent* the third holdeth the same doctrine: For in his 4 Book of the mysteries of the Masse, hee saith, that Christ hath two bodies, to wit his naturall body, which he took of the Virgin, and which was crucified, and his mysticall body, *viz.* the Church. Then he addeth: * *The mysticall body is eaten spiritually, that is to say in faith under the species of the bread.*

* *Mysticum corpus cõeditur spiritualiter, id est in fide sub specie panis.*

By all the premises it is plaine and evident, that he who forsaking the Scriptures, taketh the Fathers for his addresse or direction, intangleth himselfe into marveilous difficulties, and casteth himselfe into darknesse, and in a labyrinth without issue. And that a man must be well read in them, and observe and heed them very exactly, for to attaine to an

indifferent knowledge of them. That if any one readeth them carefully, and with an unpreoccupated mind, though he meets with many errors in them, and small agreement among themselves: Yet he shall find them so far from the doctrine of the Roman Church, as the heavens are from the earth.

## CHAP. XXXI.

*That the Church of* Rome *condemning the Impanation, is fallen her selfe into an error a thousand times more pernitious, by Transubstantiation. And of the Adoration of the accidents of the bread.*

WE have shewed that many Fathers have beleeved that the divinity of the Lord is joyned to the bread of the Eucharist, by an union comming neare unto the personall union that is between the two natures of Christ. The Transubstantiation, is an imitation of this doctrine, but in the worse: For whereas these Fathers con-

joyne

joyne the Godhead of Christ with the substance of the bread The Church of *Rome* conjoyneth Christ with the accidents of bread, with a more strait union than that which those *Impanators* did put betweene the divinity of the Lord, and the bread of the Eucharist.

For the ancient Fathers esteemed not that because of the union of Christ with the substance of the bread, the bread should be worshipped. But the *Roman* Church by reason of the union of Christs body with the accidents of the bread, worshippeth these accidents, that is to say, the roundnesse, whitenesse, savour, and breadth of the Host, with the same adoration that Christs body is worshipped with. The Counceli of *Trente* in the XIII. Session, ordaineth upon paine of a curse, that the Sacrament shall be worshipped with divine adoration, called *Latria*. Now by the Sacrament, the Councell understandeth the body of Christ with the *species* or accidents. Of which abuse hath been spoken before.

It is therefore very wrongfully that the Church of *Rome* condemnes those that have put a mysticall and unspeakable union betweene the Godhead of Christ and

*Bellar. 13 cap 5, *Nullus dubitandi locus relinquitur quin omnes Christi fideles latriæ cultū qui vero Deo debetur, huic Sanctissimo Sacramento reverationē adhibeant.*

and the bread of the Sacrament, ſince our Adverſaries themſelves bring in another, a thouſand times more abſurde and more pernicious, betweene Chriſt and the Accidents of bread. More abſurd, I ſay: For the union of two ſubſtances may eaſily be conceived; But to unite a ſubſtance with the accidents of another ſubſtance, as if one ſhould put the Moon under the accidents of a horſe, is a thing and a conceit which paſſeth all the imaginations of hypocondriaks, and which cannot fall into the mind of any man that hath not interdicted to himſelfe the uſe of reaſon. Adde moreover that this doctrine deſtroyeth the nature of the Sacrament, and the humanity of Chriſt, as we have prooved: and bindeth men to worſhip a peece of bread with divine adoration. Things, which the ancient Church never beleeved nor practiſed.

It ſeemeth that Satan, when he tempted Chriſt in the Wilderneſſe, was a projecting this doctrine, and making an eſſay or triall of it. For promiſing unto Chriſt imaginary kingdomes, he propoſed unto him accidents without a ſubject. And in ſpeaking to him of turning ſtones into bread, he ſpake to him of a Tranſubſtantiation.

CHAP.

## CHAP. XXXII.

*That the Sacrifice of the Masse was not instituted by Christ, Confession of our Adversaries.*

IN the holy Scripture, the holy Supper is not called a Sacrifice. Christ in instituting this Sacrament, offered nor presented nothing to his Father, but only to his Disciples, saying, *Take, eate.* Hee made no elevation of the Host. The Apostles worshipped not the Sacrament. In a word, there did not passe in it, any of the actions necessarily required in a Sacrifice properly so called. *Bellarmin* acknowledgeth it freely, saying, * *The oblation which is after the Consecration, belongeth to the integrity of the Sacrifice, but is not of its essence: which is proved in that the Lord made*

* Bellar. l. 1. de Missa c. 27. §. 1. *Oblatio quæ sequitur consecrationem, ad integritatem sacrificii pertinet, non ad essentiam. Quod non ad essentiam probatur, tamen ex eo quod Dominus eam oblationem non adhibuit, immo nec Apostoli in principio, ut ex Gregorio demonstratum est.*

*not this oblation, nor the Apostles themselves at the beginning, as we have demonstrated it out of Gregory.* A confession very notable: by which this Cardinall will have Christ and his Apostles to have made a Sacrifice without offering any thing: that is to say, that in the Eucharist hee offered not himselfe in Sacrifice: But now the Church of *Rome* offereth Christ Jesus in Sacrifice, against Christs example, and the example of his Apostles,

*Salmeron* Jesuite, in the XIII. Tome and first Book of Commentaries upon the Epistles of S. *Paul*, * maketh an enumeration of the unwritten Traditions, and puts in their rank *the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, that is to say the Papall Monarchy, and the service of Images, and the Masse, and the manner of Sacrificing. And the Tradition, that Christ made a Sacrifice in bread and wine.* And here are the reasons why he thinketh it was not expedient those things should be written, or taught by word of mouth. a *It is* (saith he) *a foolish thing to thinke the Apostles have written all, or given all by Tradi-*

* Parte 2. Disp. 8 §. 5 Opus. Et §. Postremo. & §. Porro.

a Part. 3. Disp. 8. §. Quinto Tradit.

*Stultum est omnia ab Apostolis scripta putare, vel omnia ab eis tradita fuisse. Et in injuriam vergeret agentis & revelantis Spiritus. Et insuave esset naturæ nostræ quæ omnia simul non capit.*

on:

*on: That would turne to injury against the holy Ghost, acting and revealing. And it would be a thing uncouth unto nature, which comprehendeth not all things at once.* And there he giveth a particular reason wherefore these * things were not to be writen, to wit, *that Christs Commandement might be kept, Give not that which is holy unto dogs.* If wee beleeve this Doctor, the doctrine of the Birth and Passion of our Saviour was given unto dogs: for it was Gods will it should be set down in writing. By these Dogges he meaneth the People and the Princes.

* §. Quinto opus. *Hæc literis consignari minime debuerant, ut servaretur præceptum Christi, Nolite dare sanctum canibus.*

Cardinall * *Baronius* maketh the same confession, and acknwledgeth ingenuously that the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is an unwritten Tradition, and whereof, by consequent, no mention is made in the Gospell.

* Baron. Annal. ad annum 53. §. 13.

And *Gregory* of *Valentia* a Jesuite, in the 4 chap of his first Book of the Masse: * *Even though this service or worship* [of the Masse] *had not been instituted by God, yet these men could not conclude that it is*

* Si *maxime ille cultus à Deo institutus non esset, concludi tamen ab istis non posset non esse legitimum, cum id ad bonitatem cultus minime requiratur.*

*not lawfull, for we haue shewed that that [to wit to bee commanded of God] is not necessarily required, for to make that a seruice be good.*

All these Doctors speaking thus, condemne tacitely the Councell of *Trent*, who in the XXII. Session, chapter 1. declareth and defineth, that by these words, *Doe this in remembrance of me*, the Lord established the Priesthood of the New Testament. Words which *Matthew* and *Marke* would not haue omitted, if by them the Lord had instituted the Sacrifice and the Priesthood of the New Testament.

CHAP.

## CHAP. XXXIII.

*That the Sacrifice of the Masse agrees neither with Scripture nor with reason.*

1. THe two third partes of Saint *Pauls* Epistle to the *Hebrews* are employed in speaking both of the Sacrifice, and of the Priesthood of the Christian Church, where nevertheless no mention is made at all of the Eucharist, nor of any other Sacrifice of redemption than the death of Christ our Lord.

2. Moreover, in many places, namely about the end of the ninth Chapter, the Apostle saith, *As it is appointed unto men once to dye, so Christ was once offered for to take away our sinnes.* Teaching us, that as man dieth but once, and that the death of men is not reiterated, neither bloodily nor unbloodily: so the Sacrifice by which Christ offered himselfe for our sinnes, receiveth no iteration. And in

in the tenth Chapter, two ſeverall times, he ſaith in expreſſe tearmes that Chriſt hath offered *Unicam oblationem*, one onely Sacrifice, and then ſate him downe on the right hand of God.

3. For ſince Chriſts death is a price, and a ſufficient Sacrifice for our redemption; there is no more need of another Sacrifice of redemption. That if for applying unto our ſelves Chriſts Sacrifice he muſt be ſacrificed againe, by the ſame reaſon for to apply his death unto our ſelves, he muſt be put to death againe. Chriſt and his death is applyed unto us by the fraction of the bread, 1. *Cor.* 10. 16. And by Baptiſme, *Gala.* 3. 27. And by that Faith whereby Saint *Paul* ſaith that Chriſt dwelleth in our hearts, *Epheſians* 3. 17. but not in ſacrificing him.

4. But how ſhould Chriſt in the Maſſe ſatisfie for our ſinnes, ſeeing he is no more in that condition of ſatisfying, nor of ſuffering for us? But onely in the ſtate of interceding and impetrating for us, as *Bellarmin* confeſſeth,* *Chriſt* (ſaith he) *cannot now merit nor ſatisfie, but onely impetrate. Wherefore the proper vertue and efficacie of this Sacrifice*

* Bellar. li. 2. de Miſſa cap. 1. §. Secundo. *Chriſtus nunc nec mereri nec ſatisfacere poteſt, ſed tantum impetrare. Igitur impetratio propria eſt hujus ſacrificij vis & efficacia.*

*sacrifice is to impetrate*, not therefore to redeeme and satisfie. Now for to impetrate, Christs intercession whereby he maketh requeſt for us, ſitting at the right hand of his Father, *Rom.* 8. 33. is ſufficient, without being needfull to ſacrifice him.

5. Wherefore the Paſtors of the Chriſtian Church, are never called Prieſts in the Scripture, for to diſtinguiſh them from the people. But all the faithfull are called Prieſts by Saint *Peter* in his firſt Epiſtle, Chap. 2. 9. And by Saint *John*, *Revelation* 1. 6. *He hath made us Kings and Prieſts unto God and his Father*,

6. The Apoſtle Saint *Paul* to the *Epheſians* 4. 11. maketh a denumeration of the Offices which Chriſt, aſcending up to heaven, left here to his Church, *And he gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts: and ſome Paſtors and Teachers.* Of Prieſts and Sacrificers he ſpeaketh not one word. No more than in the firſt to *Timothy*, and in the Epiſtle to *Titus*, where he deſcribeth the duty of Prieſts (whom hee calleth alſo Biſhops) and of Deacons, without making any mention of this Prieſthood.

7. It

7. It is evident that to be a Sacrificer, is a thing more excellent than to be Sacrificed. So *Aaron* was more excellent than the beasts that he offered: Not onely because he was a man, and had these Sacrifices in his power: but also because these Lambes and Bullocks were figures of Christ, as hee was a man, who was to die for us: but *Aaron* represented Christ, as hee was God, offering his body in Sacrifice to his Father for our sinnes. Priests therefore boasting themselves of sacrificing Christ, advance themselves above Christ.

8. In all Sacrifices the thing sacrificed and offered unto God, must be destroyed and killed. But in the Masse Christ is not destroyed and suffereth nothing there. Therefore in the Masse Christ is not sacrificed. To say that in the Masse Christs sacramentall being is destroyed, is a pure mockerie. For Christ hath but one being, to wit his naturall being. And this word of *Sacramentall being*, is as much as a *figurative being*, which is a Chymera or fond conceit. The principall is that in the Masse they pretend to sacrifice Christ for our redemption. But the Sa-

cramentall

tantiall or significative being of the Lord is not the price of our redeption, & is not sacrificed for us. Thus if the Sacrifice be made when the species of the bread and wine are destroyed, we must say that the Sacrifice is made in the stomach of the Priest some houres after the Masse is ended: for there must be some time for to destroy the *species* by the disgestion.

9. Furthermore in all Sacrifices the thing sacrificed must bee Consecrated, and in every Sacrifice there must be some Consecration. But in the Masse there is nothing consecrated. Not the bread, for they hold it is no more bread. Not Christs body; for men can not consecrate him: It is he that consecrateth us. Not the accidents of bread: For they be not offered to God in Sacrifice: otherwise the Masse would be a Sacrifice of accidents, of colour, of savor, of lines, and superficits.

10. Our Adversaries never find themselves more puzled, than when they are put to finde in the institution of this Sacrament, some action wherein this Sacrifice doth consist by which they pretend that the consecrated Hoste is sacrificed to God in propitiatory Sacrifice. Doth this Sacrifice consist in the words whereby

whereby the Priest presenteth the body of Christ unto God, and prayes him to have that offering acceptable? But we have seene in the foregoing Chapter that our Adversaries doe confesse, that Christ made not that oblation, and presented nothing to God his Father. Doth this Sacrifice consist in the fraction of the bread? But that is impossible; for Christ brake the bread before hee uttered the words of Consecration, therefore hee brake no consecrated Hoste. And when the Priest lets the Host fall whole into the Chalice without breaking it, the Masse leaveth not for that to be called a Sacrifice, as *Bellarmin* * acknowledgeth. Perhaps they will say the Sacrifice consisteth in the manducation: But that cannot be. For eating is not sacrificing. That if eating be sacrificing, every one of the Peoples shal be a sacrificing Priest: and the Peoples mouthes shall be as many Altars. Vnder *Moses* Law in all the sacrifices, after which the people did eate of the things sacrificed, the sacred feast was made some houres after the Sacrifice was ended. Neither can the Sacrifice consist in the pronouncing of the words of Consecration: For by these words *This is my body*, the Priest offereth nothing

* Bellar. lib 1. de Missa. cap. 27. §. 60. *Si forte panis consecratus in calicem decidat, non solet frãgi, sed relinquitur ita integrum usque ad sumptionẽ, nec tamen sacrificium irritum, aut essentialiter immutari creditur. Adde quod hac ceremonia Dominus non videtur esse usus.*

nothing to God. But every Sacrifice is an offering made unto God. Furthermore, in every Sacrifice, he that ſacrificeth, addreſſeth himſelfe to God, but theſe words are addreſſed to the bread. Which is more, we have ſeene hereabove the Confeſſion of our Adverſaries, acknowledging that in all this action Chriſt offered nothing to God. Therefore he made no Sacrifice.

11. It is to be noted that in the *Roman* Church the Order of Prieſthood is a Sacrament, whoſe inſtitution they will have to be found in the Inſtitution of the Euchariſt, when the Lord ſaid, *Doe this*, as if Chriſt by one and the ſame words had inſtituted two Sacraments. With as much abſurditie, as if one would needs finde the Inſtitution of Marriage or of Extreame Vnction in the inſtitution of Baptiſme. That if theſe words, *Doe this in remembrance of mee*, bee the formall and expreſſe words whereby Chriſt conferred the Order of Prieſthood, how comes it to paſſe that the Biſhops, when they doe conferre that Order in the Ember weeks, make no mention of theſe words at all?

12. Our Adverſaries put two ſorts of Sacrifice. The one bloody, the other

unbloody, which they call *the Sacrifice of Melchisedek*, and which they say to be farre more excellent than the bloody sacrifice, and will have the Masse to be the Sacrifice after the Order of *Melchisedek*. Whence followeth that the Masse is more excellent than Christs death, which is a bloody Sacrifice. It is great wonder then that the Apostle to the *Hebrewes* speaking so at large of the Priesthood of *Melchisedek*, maketh not any mention at all of Masse, nor of Eucharist.

13. But how is it that by these words *Doe this in remembrance of mee*, Christ should command men to sacrifice him in the Masse, since it is impossible to sacrifice Christ in remembrance of Christ? seeing also that Saint *Paul* immediately after these words, addeth the explication of them, saying, *For as often as yee eate this bread and drink this cup, ye doe shew the Lords death*, 1. *Cor.* 11. He teacheth us that to *Doe this*, is to eate bread and drink the cup in remembrance of the Lords death.

Here therefore every man that feares God, and loves the Lord Jesus, shal consider what a crime it is for mortal men and sinners to intrude and take upon

themselves to Sacrifice the Eternall Sonne of God to his Father, and to bee Priests after the Order of *Melchisedek*, without charge and without commission.

## CHAP. XXXIIII.

*In what sence the holy Supper may be called a Sacrifice. Of* Melchisedeks *Sacrifice. And of the Oblation whereof* Malachy *speaketh.*

THe holy Scripture calleth our Almes, our Prayers, our Praises and Thankesgivings, and generally what worship soever wee render unto God, *Sacrifices*. In this sence the holy Supper may be called a Sacrifice. For the question betweene us and our Adversaries, is not whether the Eucharist may be called a Sacrifice: But whether it be truly and properly a Sacrifice of redemption, and whether the Priests in the Masse sacrifice the body of Christ really

and truely for the sins of the quick and of the dead.

Touching that, our Adversaries bring no manner of proofe out of the new Testament, wherein nevertheless the institution of this Sacrifice should appeare. Only they alleadge out of the Old Testament the example of *Melchisedek*, who as they say sacrificed bread and wine *Gen.*14.18. Which they produce falsly, for that place saith no such thing. *Melchisedek* brought out bread and wine to *Abraham* for to refresh his wearie troopes, but offered not bread and wine to *Abraham* in Sacrifice. The very Bible of the *Roman* Church hath *proferens*, and not *offerens*. Nevertheless we will suppose that place to be faithfully alleadged. For if the Masse be the Sacrifice of *Melchisedek*, it will follow that the Masse is a Sacrifice of bread and wine and not of flesh and bones and blood. From thence it followeth also that the Masse is not a Sacrifice of redemption. For bread and wine offered up in Sacrifice cannot bee the price of our redemption. It were an abuse to think that *Melchisedek* hath sacrificed bread for the redemption of any one. The propitiatory sacrifices, under the Old Testament, were

made by the death of the victime: and no propitiation was made without ſhedding of blood, ſaith the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 9. 22. In ſumme, it is to ſpeak againſt the common ſence, to argue thus: *Melchiſedek offered bread and wine: Therefore the Prieſt ſacrificeth the Lords body and blood.*

They object likewiſe a place of *Malachy*, chap. 1. wherein God promiſeth that in every place, *Incenſe ſhall be offered unto his Name, and a pure offering.* Which is a Propheſie of the calling of the *Gentiles*, whereby God foretels that among the nations, an acceptable ſervice ſhall bee offered unto him. Of the Sacrifice of the Lords body: he ſpeaketh nothing of it. The novelty of this ſervice is, that it ſhall be made among all Nations, whereas in *Malachies* time it was but made in the Jewiſh Nation.

They ſay alſo that the Paſſeover of the Old Teſtament was a Sacrifice, and by conſequent that the Lords Supper, that ſucceeded thereunto, muſt be a Sacrifice. They ſpeake with as much reaſon, as if I ſhould ſay that the night muſt be cleare, becauſe it ſucceedeth to the day which is bright and cleere, and that

and truely for the sins of the quick and of the dead.

Touching that, our Adversaries bring no manner of proofe out of the new Testament, wherein nevertheless the institution of this Sacrifice should appeare. Only they alleadge out of the Old Testament the example of *Melchisedek*, who as they say sacrificed bread and wine *Gen.* 14.18. Which they produce falsly, for that place saith no such thing. *Melchisedek* brought out bread and wine to *Abraham* for to refresh his wearied troopes, but offered not bread and wine to *Abraham* in Sacrifice. The very Bible of the *Roman* Church hath *proferens*, and not *offerens*. Nevertheless we will suppose that place to be faithfully alleadged. For if the Masse be the Sacrifice of *Melchisedek*, it will follow that the Masse is a Sacrifice of bread and wine and not of flesh and bones and blood. From thence it followeth also that the Masse is not a Sacrifice of redemption. For bread and wine offered up in Sacrifice cannot bee the price of our redemption. It were an abuse to think that *Melchisedek* hath sacrificed bread for the redemption of any one. The propitiatory sacrifices, under the Old Testament, were

made by the death of the victime: and no propitiation was made without ſhedding of blood, ſaith the Apoſtle, *Heb. 9. 22.* In ſumme, it is to ſpeak againſt the common ſence, to argue thus: *Melchiſedek offered bread and wine: Therefore the Prieſt ſacrificeth the Lords body and blood.*

They object likewiſe a place of *Malachy*, chap. 1. wherein God promiſeth that in every place, *Incenſe ſhall be offered unto his Name, and a pure offering.* Which is a Propheſie of the calling of the *Gentiles*, whereby God foretels that among the nations, an acceptable ſervice ſhall bee offered unto him. Of the Sacrifice of the Lords body: he ſpeaketh nothing of it. The novelty of this ſervice is, that it ſhall be made among all Nations, whereas in *Malachies* time it was but made in the Jewiſh Nation.

They ſay alſo that the Paſſeover of the Old Teſtament was a Sacrifice, and by conſequent that the Lords Supper, that ſucceeded thereunto, muſt be a Sacrifice. They ſpeake with as much reaſon, as if I ſhould ſay that the night muſt be cleare, becauſe it ſucceedeth to the day which is bright and cleere, and that

and truely for the sins of the quick and of the dead.

Touching that, our Adversaries bring no manner of proofe out of the new Testament, wherein nevertheless the institution of this Sacrifice should appeare. Only they alleadge out of the Old Testament the example of *Melchisedek*, who as they say sacrificed bread and wine, *Gen.*14.18. Which they produce falsly, for that place saith no such thing. *Melchisedek* brought out bread and wine to *Abraham* for to refresh his wearied troopes, but offered not bread and wine to *Abraham* in Sacrifice. The very Bible of the *Roman* Church hath *proferens*, and not *offerens*. Nevertheless we will suppose that place to be faithfully alleadged. For if the Masse be the Sacrifice of *Melchisedek*, it will follow that the Masse is a Sacrifice of bread and wine and not of flesh and bones and blood. From thence it followeth also that the Masse is not a Sacrifice of redemption. For bread and wine offered up in Sacrifice cannot bee the price of our redemption. It were an abuse to think that *Melchisedek* hath sacrificed bread for the redemption of any one. The propitiatory sacrifices, under the Old Testament, were

made by the death of the victime: and no propitiation was made without shedding of blood, saith the Apostle, *Heb.* 9. 22. In summe, it is to speak against the common sence, to argue thus: *Melchisedek offered bread and wine: Therefore the Priest sacrificeth the Lords body and blood.*

They object likewise a place of *Malachy*, chap. 1. wherein God promiseth that in every place, *Incense shall be offered unto his Name, and a pure offering.* Which is a Propheſie of the calling of the *Gentiles*, whereby God foretels that among the nations, an acceptable service shall bee offered unto him. Of the Sacrifice of the Lords body: he speaketh nothing of it. The novelty of this service is, that it shall be made among all Nations, whereas in *Malachies* time it was but made in the Jewish Nation.

They say also that the Passeover of the Old Testament was a Sacrifice, and by consequent that the Lords Supper, that succeeded thereunto, must be a Sacrifice. They speake with as much reason, as if I should say that the night must be cleare, because it succeedeth to the day which is bright and cleere, and that

old Age is ſtrong and luſty, ſeeing it ſucceedeth to yong Age which is ſtrong, and luſty. The ſucceſſion of one thing unto another, bringeth commonly great alterations. Adde to this that our Adverſaries will not have the Maſſe to be ſuch a Sacrifice as that Paſſeover was. For the Paſſeover was not offered by the Prieſts, and was not made upon the Altar of the Temple: it was a domeſticall ſacrifice which particular men made at home in their own houſes; As it appeareth by the Paſſeover which Chriſt did celebrate among his Diſciples, in which no Prieſt was employed. And even though by this example our Adverſaries had prooved that the Euchariſt is a Sacrifice: yet there would remaine for them to prove that in this Sacrifice Chriſts body is really ſacrificed.

## CHAP. XXXV.

## CHAP. XXXV.

### *In what sense the Fathers have called the Eucharist a Sacrifice.*

THe ancient Fathers indeavouring to draw the *Heathen* unto the Christian Faith, who esteemed there is no Religion without sacrifice, and the *Jewes* whose Religion under the Old Testament did chiefly consist in Sacrifices, have called the holy Supper a Sacrifice, and the Sacred Table an Altar, and those that serve at it, *Levites*.

But they shew sufficiently how they call the holy Supper a Sacrifice, since they call it *Eucharist*, that is to say Thankesgiving, and not a Sacrifice of Propitiation. Saint *Austin* calleth it indeed the Sacrifice of our price in the ninth Book of Confessions, chapter 12. But wee have produced a multitude of

places out of the same Father, that say, that in matter of Sacraments the signes are wont to take the name of the things signified. That this is the sense and meaning of the Fathers when they speak thus, appeareth in that they call also the Eucharist Christs death. As *Cyprian* in his 63 Epistle, * *The Lords Passion is the Sacrifice wee do offer.* And *Chrysostome* in the 21 Homily upon the Acts of the Apostles, a *Whilest this death is a perfecting, and this dreadfull Sacrifice, and these ineffable mysteries.* And so the Canon *Hoc est*, in the 2 Distinction of the Consecration, b *The immolation of Christs flesh which is made by the hands of the Priest, is called the Passion, Death, and Crucifixion of Christ, not according to the truth, but by a significant mystery.*

*Austin* in his 23 Epistle to *Bonifacius*: *Was not Christ once sacrificed in himselfe? and yet hee is sacrificed to the People in a sacred signe.* And in his 10 Book of the City of God, chap: 5. c *The visible Sacrifice is a Sacrament, that is to say a sacred signe of the invisible Sacrifice.* And a little after,

* *Passio est Domini sacrificium quod offerimus.*

a Τοῦ θανάτου ἐκείνου, ἐπιτελουμένου, τῆς φρικτῆς θυσίας, τῶν ἀφάτων μυστηρίων.

b *Vocatur ipsa immolatio carnis quæ Sacerdotis manibus fit Christi passio, mors, crucifixio, non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio.*

c *Sacrificium visibile invisibilis Sacrificii Sacramentum id est sacrum signum.*

* That

* *That which men do call Sacrifice, is a signe of the true Sacrifice.* Note that he saith, that men do call it a Sacrifice, acknowledging tacitely the holy Scripture doth not call it so. Wee have then in these places of S. *Austin*, a cleare exposition of this place wherein he calleth the Eucharist *the Sacrifice of our price.*

* *Illud quod ab omnibus appellatur Sacrificii, est signum veri sacrificii.*

The sixth Book of *Apostolicall Constitutions* of *Clemens*, chap. 23. a *The Lord instead of a bloody Sacrifice hath instituted a reasonable, and unbloody, and mysticall Sacrifice, which is celebrated in consideration of the Lords death by the signes of his body and blood.*

a *Pro sacrificio cruento rationale & incruentum ac mysticum sacrificium instituit, quod in mortem Domini per symbola corporis et sanguinis sui celebratur.*

In the 4. Book of Sacraments attributed to S. *Ambrose*, chap. 5. wee have these words of the ancient Service: b *Grant that this oblation be imputed unto us as reasonable, acceptable, which is the FIGURE of the body and blood of the Lord.* The succeeding ages have razed out the word *Figure.*

b *Fac nobis hanc oblationem ascriptam, rationabilem acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis & sanguinis Domini.*

*Procopius Gazæus* upon the 49. chap. of *Genesis*, *Christ gave to his Disciples the Image, or Figure, and Type of his body and blood, receiving no more the bloody Sacrifices of the Law.*

*Eusebius*

places out of the same Father, that say, that in matter of Sacraments the signes are wont to take the name of the things signified. That this is the sense and meaning of the Fathers when they speak thus, appeareth in that they call also the Eucharist Christs death. As *Cyprian* in his 63 Epistle, * *The Lords Passion is the Sacrifice wee do offer.* And *Chrysostome* in the 21 Homily upon the Acts of the Apostles, a *Whilest this death is a perfecting, and this dreadful Sacrifice, and these ineffable mysteries.* And so the Canon *Hoc est*, in the 2 Distinction of the Consecration, b *The immolation of Christs flesh which is made by the hands of the Priest, is called the Passion, Death, and Crucifixion of Christ, not according to the truth, but by a significant mystery.*

*Austin* in his 23 Epistle to *Bonifacius*: *Was not Christ once sacrificed in himselfe? and yet hee is sacrificed to the People in a sacred signe.* And in his 10 Book of the City of God, chap: 5. c *The visible Sacrifice is a Sacrament, that is to say a sacred signe of the invisible Sacrifice.* And a little after,

* *Passio est Domini sacrificium quod offerimus.*

a Τοῦ θανάτου ἐκείνου, ἐπιτελουμένου, τῆς φρικτῆς θυσίας, τῶν ἀφάτων μυστηρίων.

b *Vocatur ipsa immolatio carnis quæ Sacerdotis manibus fit Christi passio, mors, crucifixio, non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio.*

c *Sacrificium visibile invisibilis Sacrificii Sacramentum id est sacrum signum.*

* That

[a] *That which men do call Sacrifice, is a signe of the true Sacrifice.* Note that he saith, that men do call it a Sacrifice, acknowledging tacitely the holy Scripture doth not call it so. Wee have then in these places of S. *Austin*, a cleare exposition of this place wherein he calleth the Eucharist *the Sacrifice of our price.*

[a] *Illud quod ab omnibus appellatur Sacrificii, est signum veri sacrificii.*

The sixth Book of *Apostolicall Constitutions* of *Clemens*, chap. 23. [a] *The Lord instead of a bloody Sacrifice hath instituted a reasonable, and unbloody, and mysticall Sacrifice, which is celebrated in consideration of the Lords death by the signes of his body and blood.*

[a] *Pro sacrificio cruento rationale & incruentum ac mysticum sacrificium instituit, quod in mortem Domini per symbola corporis & sanguinis sui celebratur.*

In the 4. Book of Sacraments attributed to S. *Ambrose*, chap. 5. wee have these words of the ancient Service: [b] *Graunt that this oblation be imputed unto us as reasonable, acceptable, which is the FIGURE of the body and blood of the Lord.* The succeeding ages have razed out the word *Figure.*

[b] *Fac nobis hanc oblationem ascriptam, rationabilem acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis & sanguinis Domini.*

*Procopius Gazeus* upon the 49. chap. of *Genesis*, *Christ gave to his Disciples the Image, or Figure, and Type of his body and blood, receiving no more the bloody Sacrifices of the Law.*

*Eusebius*

*Eusebius* in the 10 chapter of his first Book of *the Evangelicall Demonstration*, [c] *The Lord having offered a Sacrifice and an excellent victime unto his Father for the salvation of us all, hath appointed us to offer continually the remembrance of it instead of a Sacrifice.*

And in the same place, [b] *Wee have received the remembrance of this Sacrifice for to celebrate it at his own table, by the signes of his Body and Blood, according to the institution of the New Testament.*

In a word, the Fathers are full of such places. Wherefore in the Eucharist they put no difference between the Sacrament and the Sacrifice. But to speak properly, there is such difference between a Sacrifice and a Sacrament, as between giving and receiving: For in a Sacrifice we offer unto God, but in a Sacrament we receive from God. The Fathers do not make this distinction. For, by reason the Sacrament is a signe and a figure of the Sacrifice, they call the Sacrament a Sacrifice.

This kind of speaking, to call the Lords Supper a Sacrifice, had its beginning from the offerings and gifts, which in old time the people offered upon the sacred table afore the Communion, which gifts were com-

[a] Θαυμάσιον θύμα καὶ σφάγιον ἐξαίρετον τῷ πατρὶ καλλιερησάμενος, ὁ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁπάντων ἡμῶν ἀνήνεγκε σωτηρίας, μνήμην καὶ ἡμῖν παραδοὺς ἀντὶ θυσίας, τοῦ θεῷ δηνεκῶς προσφέρειν.

[b] Τούτου τοῦ θύματος τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτραπέζης ἐπιτελεῖν διὰ συμβόλων τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου αἵματος, κατὰ θεσμοὺς τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης παρειληφότες.

commonly called Sacrifices and Oblations. *Cyprian* in his Sermon of Almes, [a] chides a rich woman that had brought no Sacrifice, and yet took her part of the Sacrifices the poor had brought. And in the 21 Distinction at the Canon *Cleros*, [b] *Let the Subdeacons in the Lords Temple receive the Oblations of the Faithfull, and carry them to the Levites, that they may put them upon the Altars.* Which manner of speech remaines yet at this day in the Masse, wherein the Priest before the Cōsecration, saith, *Receive, Lord, this immaculate Host, &c.* as is acknowledged by *Bellarmin* in his first Book of the Masse, ch. 27. And he prooves it by *Irenæus*, who in the 4 Book, chap. 32. saith, we offer unto God a Sacrifice of his creatures, that is to say, bread and wine: And that, even before the Consecration.

In that therefore, the Fathers have said nothing but what is agreeable & conformable unto the Faith. Yet nevertheless the abuse that hath followed thereon a longtime after, is unto us an excellent example that the safest way is to cleave to the Apostles language, and not to depart from the stile of the holy Scripture.

[a] *Lecuples & Dives, Dominicum celebrare te credis, quæ corbonum non respicis, quæ in Dominicū sine sacrificio venis, quæ partem de sacrificio quod pauper obtulit sumis.*

[b] *Hypodiaconi oblationes in tēplo Domini à fidelibus suscipiant, & Levitis superponēdas altaribus deferāt.*

THE

# THE SECOND BOOK, OF The Manducation of the Bodie of Christ.

## CHAP. I.

*Of two sorts of manducation of Christs flesh, to wit, Spirituall and Corporall, and which is the best.*

METaphors are similies contracted and reduced to a word. So wee say *feeding* for *teaching*, and *to flourish* for *to be in prosperity*, and we call Pride a swelling, and truth a light. We say of a childes tongue,

tongue, that it is untied, and of his wit, that it is displayed.

These Metaphors, besides the ornament, have some utility. For they propose an Image of the things whereof wee speake, and make them more intelligible by a tacite comparison. Specially, it is a thing very usuall and frequent, to expresse the functions and qualities of the soule, by tearmes borrowed from the actions and corporall qualities. So we say that Envy fretteth, that love burneth, that Covetousnesse is a thirst of money, and that hope is a tickling or soothing.

The holy Scripture is full of such manner of speeches, wherein nothing is more frequent than to speake of good instructions as of meats and drinks, and of the Graces of God, as of a water that quencheth the thirst, and of the desire of these graces as of a hunger and thirst. So in the 9 of *Proverbes* the supreame Wisedome saith, *Come, eate of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled.* And *David* in the 36 *Psalme* saith, *God makes us drink in the river of his pleasures.* And in the 34 *Psalme, O taste and see that the Lord is good.* And *Ieremy* in the 15 chap. *Thy words were found, and I did presently eate them.*

[illegible]

John 6.33.
and chap.
35. & 14.

tongue, that it is untied, and of his wit, that it is displayed.

These Metaphors, besides the ornament, have some utility. For they propose an Image of the things whereof wee speake, and make them more intelligible by a tacite comparison. Specially, it is a thing very usuall and frequent, to expresse the functions and qualities of the soule, by tearmes borrowed from the actions and corporall qualities. So we say that Envy fretteth, that love burneth, that Covetousnesse is a thirst of money, and that hope is a tickling or soothing.

The holy Scripture is full of such manner of speeches, wherein nothing is more frequent than to speake of good instructions as of meats and drinks, and of the Graces of God, as of a water that quencheth the thirst, and of the desire of these graces as of a hunger and thirst. So in the 9 of *Proverbes* the supreame Wisedome saith, *Come, eate of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled.* And *David* in the 36 *Psalme* saith, *God makes us drink in the river of his pleasures.* And in the 34 *Psalme, O taste and see that the Lord is good.* And *Ieremy* in the 15 chap. *Thy words were found, and I did presently eate them,*

them. And God himselfe in the 55 of *Isayah*, inviteth the thirsty to drink of the waters. And that it may bee understood he speakes of a spirituall drink, he addes, *Encline your eare, and your soule shall live.* According to this kind of speech S. *Petir* in his 1 Epistle, chap. 2, exhorts us to desire *the milk of intelligence*, to wit the Word of God. And S. *Paul* in the first to the *Corinthians*, chap. 3. saith he hath given them *milk, and not solid meat.* Christ our Lord is he that hath used very often such metaphors, taken from corporall meats and drinks. He saith in the 4. chap. of S. *John*, that *his meat is to do his Fathers will.* And in the same chap. he promiseth to give *water, whereof whosoever shall drink, shall never thirst.* And in the chap. 7. 37. *If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink.* And in the 5. chapter of S. *Matthew*, *Blessed are they which doe hunger and thirst after righteousnesse.*

With such manner of figurative speeches is woven and interlaced a great part of the 6 chap. of S. *John*, where the Lord speaking to the *Capernaites*, promiseth to give them the bread of Heaven, and saith that his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed. Two occasions mooved him to speak so. For the Jews

of

of *Capernaum* making him inferior to *Moses*, and objecting unto him, as by reproach of impotency, that *Moses* had given unto the Iews the *Manna* which they call the bread of Heaven: the Lord from thence takes occasion to tell them he would give them another bread descended from Heaven, farre better than the *Manna*, to wit himselfe, come downe from Heaven for to bee the food of soules, and for to vivifie them. The other cause that mooved him to speak in figured tearmes, is that he was speaking unto ungratefull and rebellious Iews, to whom S. *Matthew* saith, *he spake not without a parable, Matth.* 13.34

Here our Adversaries acknowledge with us, that there is a manner of eating the body of Christ which is spirituall, and which is done not by the corporall mouth, but by the Faith in Christ Iesus, in whom we find our life and spirituall food. The Councell of *Trente* in the XIII Session, chap. 8. teaches the same, saying: *Some eate this bread, only spiritually and by a lively Faith.*

But besides this spirituall manducation, the Church of *Rome* forgeth to her selfe a corporall manducation, whereby the Faithfull in the Eucharist do chew

and

and eate with their very teeth the body of our Saviour Christ, and take it with the corporall mouth, and make him to enter into their stomacks, and do call this a reall and true manducation, for to oppose it to the spirituall manducation, whereof they speake very often with contempt, as of a picture and of a thing which consists only in imagination. The Councell of *Trente* intimates so much tacitely, saying, there be some that eate this bread only spiritually, as if it were a small thing in comparison of the reall eating of it by the mouth of the body.

Yet nevertheless when wee presse them a little, they are forced to avow that the spirituall manducation is a great deale better: and that the corporall manducation, which they maintaine and defend so stiffly and with so much ardour, is a small thing in regard of the spirituall. For they confesse that many are saved without partaking of the Eucharist, but that none are saved without beleeving in Christ. And that many eate the Sacrament, which nevertheless do perish eternally: but that whosoever eateth Christs flesh spiritually and with true Faith, shall have eternall salvation, according to the Lords saying in the third

chap. of S. *John*, that *whosoever believeth on him, shall not perish, but have eternall life.* Which is more, our Adversaries do acknowledge with us, that the manducation of the Sacrament, without the spirituall manducation by Faith, is not only unprofitable, but even turnes into condemnation: and that it is profitable and usefull, but for, and because of the spirituall manducation. But the spirituall manducation, by it selfe alone, and without the corporall manducation, leaves not to be profitable, and alwayes necessary to salvation. The manducation of the Sacrament, by the mouth of the body, is common both to good and bad, and hypocrites partake thereof as well as the true Faithfull: yea our Adversaries hold, that beasts may eate Christs body, and that Mice do carry away sometimes the body of the Lord: But the spirituall manducation, is proper and peculiar to Gods Children, and none but the true Faithfull can be partakers thereof. Christ in the 15 of S. *Matthew*, saith: *that which goeth into the mouth, defileth not a man*: whence follows that neither can it sanctifie a man.

In this, S. *Austin* is far from that language which the *Roman* Church holdeth now

now a dayes, who acknowledgeth no other true and reall manducation of Christs body, than that which is made by the bodily mouth in the Eucharist. For this holy man on the contrary, holdeth that there is no other true and reall manducation of Christs body, but the spirituall: and that that which is done in the Sacrament by the mouth of the body, is not a true manducation. He teacheth it in his 21 book of the *City of God*, chap. 25. [a] *The Lord* (saith he) *sheweth what it is to eate the body of Christ, not in Sacrament only, but in truth.* And in the same place, [b] *They have eaten the body of Christ, not only in Sacrament, but also truely and indeed.* To this holy Doctor, *Thomas* joynes himselfe in this point, in his 7 lesson upon the 6 of S. *John*, where speaking of him that eateth spiritually the body of Christ, he saith, [c] *It is that man that eateth the body of Christ, not only Sacramentally, but also in truth.*

[a] *Dominus ostendit quid sit non Sacramento tenus sed re vera corpus Christi manducare.*

[b] *Non solo Sacramẽto, sed re vera manducaverunt corpus Christi.*

[c] *Hic est ille, qui non Sacramentaliter tantum sed re vera corpus Christi manducat.*

## CHAP. II.

*That in the 6 Chapter of S. Iohn the Lord speakes not of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, nor of the manducation of his flesh by the mouth of the body.*

BY the corporall manducation, wee understand the manducation of the bread and wine, which Christ hath honored with the title of his body and blood, because they are the Sacrament and remembrance of the same. But our Adversaries pretend to eate really the body of Christ with their mouth, and to make him passe into their stomach: and for to prop this so grosse and Capernaitish manducation, they alleadge the sixth of Saint *Iohn*, where Christ saith that he is the bread come downe from Heaven, and promiseth to give his flesh to eate.

1. For to beleeve that, a man must of purpose put out his own eyes, and give the

the Son of God the lye: For all this diſcourſe is addreſſed and ſpoken to the Jewes of *Capernaum*, to whom hee promiſeth to give his fleſh to eate. If by theſe words hee had promiſed to give them the Euchariſt, hee would have deceived them: for he never adminiſtred nor preſented the holy Supper unto them.

2. That appeareth by the time wherein the Lord held this diſcourſe. It was when the holy Supper was not as yet inſtituted: no, nor till about two yeares after. How could the Lords Diſciples have underſtood that hee ſpake of the Euchariſt unto them, which was not, and whereof he had never ſpoken before?

3. Where is there in all this diſcourſe of the Lord the leaſt mention of a Table, or of a Chalice, or of a Supper, or of a Fraction of Bread, or of a diſtribution of the Sacrament among many? In ſumme, of any of the actions wherein the adminiſtration of this Sacrament doth conſiſt?

4. It is to be noted that Chriſt ſpeaketh often in the preſent tenſe. He doth not ſay, *I ſhall be the bread* come downe from John 6.33. and chap. 35. & 14.

from heaven: and *I ſhall be the bread of life.* But, *I am the bread come downe from heaven*; and, *I am the bread of life.* And, *He that eateth my fleſh, hath eta nall life.* He was then the bread of life before the holy Supper was inſtituted, and might have beene eaten then, and was the food of the ſoule, when the holy Supper had as yet no being.

5. Now that by *eating* and *drinking* the Lord meaneth to beleeve and to truſt in him, and thereby to be nouriſhed and vivified: he ſhewes it himſelfe, ſaying in the 35 Verſe, *I am the bread of life, he that commeth to me, ſhall never hunger: and hee that beleeveth on mee, ſhall never thirſt.* Who ſees not that in this place, *beleeving* is put for *drinking*, ſince by beleeving the thirſt is quenched? And as by that word of *comming* hee ſpeaketh of a ſpirituall comming: ſo by that word, *drinking*, hee meaneth and underſtandeth a kinde of ſpirituall drinking.

6. And when the Lord ſaith in the 47. and 48 Verſe, *Hee that beleeveth in mee, hath eternall life: I am the bread of life*: who ſees not that this bread is taken in and by beleeving? For Chriſt ſheweth how he is the bread of life, to wit

wit becauſe he that beleeves on him, hath eternall life.

7. The very words whereupon our Adverſaries ground themſelves moſt, are thoſe which make moſt againſt them. In the 53 Verſe the Lord ſaith, *Except ye eate the fleſh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his blood, yee have no life in you.* There it is evident he ſpeakes of a manducation neceſſary unto ſalvation, and without which none can be ſaved. Hee ſpeakes not therefore of the manducation of the Sacrament by the mouth of the body, ſeeing that without it ſo many are ſaved. Now to ſay that this corporall manducation is neceſſary, not indeed, but in vow and deſire, is to come neare our beleefe, and reduce that neceſſity to the ſpirituall manducation. Moreover, to ſay that none are ſaved without deſiring to be partakers of the holy Communion, is to exclude from ſalvation, *John* the Baptiſt, and the good *Theife* crucified with the Lord, who never participated thereof, neither in deed nor in vow. And we might bring many examples of *Pagans* and *Idolaters*, who by hearing of the wordes of the Martyrs, were converted at the ſame inſtant, and put to death at that very houre,

Read the Homily of the 40 martyrs in *Baſil.*

houre, without any body ever having told them of this Sacrament, and consequently without having made any vow at all to bee made partakers thereof. Yea many have suffered Martyrdome without being Baptized, and by consequent verie farre from disposing themselves to receive the Eucharist.

8. The same appeareth by that which Christ addeth in the 54 Verse. *Hee that eateth my flesh, hath eternall life.* He speaketh not of the manducation of the Sacrament: For many that eate it, have not eternall life. Their ordinary evasion is, that Christ speaketh of him that eateth his flesh worthily. Wherein appeareth how strong the truth is on our side. For according to our beleefe, the Lords words are true without any addition. But our Adversaries doe adde some glosses for to escape and save themselves. Which addition they make of their owne head, without the Word of God. One may well eate the bread unworthily, as Saint *Paul* saith, 1. *Cor.* 11. *Whosoever eateth this bread unworthily.* But it is impossible to eate the Lords flesh unworthily, since *to eate* is *to beleeve*, as we have shewed. A man cannot beleeve in Christ unworthily, no more than to

love

love God unworthily: since that in beleeving in Christ, and in loving of God, consisteth all our dignity. Cardinall *Cajetan* observeth the same, upon the sixt of Saint *John*, saying, *Christ doth not say, He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood worthily, but he that eateth and drinketh: to the end wee may understand that he speaketh of a meate and of a drinke that hath no need of modification*, &c. It appeareth then plainely that this speech is not to be understood literally, and that the Lord speaketh not of eating and drinking the Sacrament, but of beleeving, and of feeding spiritually by faith in his death.

9. The Lord addeth in the 56 Verse, *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.* Words that decide this question: For they would be false if they should be taken and understood of the manducation of the Sacrament: it being a thing most certaine that profane men and hypocrites which receive the Sacrament, dwell not in Christ, nor Christ in them. Now to dwell in Christ, is to be conjoyned to him with an union constant and continuall and mutuall betweene Christ and the beleever. As *Cornelius Jansenius*, Bishop

Bishop of *Gant*, teacheth very well. *He* (saith hee) *that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him: that is to say, he is conjoyned unto me inseparably and intimately, and I to him:* and proves it by other places of Saint *John* in his first Epistle, 4. 16. *Hee that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him.* And in the same place, *Hereby we know that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.* And in the third Chapter, 24 Verse, he saith, that *hee that keepeth his Commandements, dwelleth in him, and hee in him.* From whence he inferreth that also in this 6 Chapter of Saint *John*, the Lord speaks of a kinde of eating, which is proper unto those that have a faith working through charity, and not of a corporall manducation, whereof wicked men are partakers.

Concord. Evang. ca. 59. *Quiedit carnem meam & bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet, & ego in eo: hoc est individuise & intime mihi conjungitur, & ego illi.*

10. That if for to make Christ to dwell in us, hee must be eaten by the mouth of the bodie: Christ by the same reason must eate us, that we may dwell in him.

11. Christ, for to divert and turne away our mindes from carnall thoughts, addeth in the 63 Verse, *The flesh profiteth nothing, It is the Spirit that quickneth.*

Since

since that by the *spirit* hee meaneth his Spirit whereby he regenerateth us, by the flesh also he understandeth his humane body. Whereof he saith that it profiteth nothing, to wit, being taken after that manner as the *Capernaites* did imagine themselves. What would it profit a man to have in his stomach the head and feet of Christ Jesus, whether hee doe swallow him by peeces and parcels, or doe swallow him whole? For the absurditie is alike.

12. Christ addeth, *The words that I have spoken unto you, are spirit and life*, that is to say, are spirituall and quickening. They are not quickning but to them that understand them spiritually, and that imagine not a carnall and corporall manducation. So teacheth Saint *Austin* in his 27 Treatise upon Saint *John*. Hee demandeth, * *What meaneth, these words are spirit and life?* His answer is, *That they must be understood spiritually. Hast thou understood them spiritually? They are spirit and life unto thee. Hast thou understood them carnally? In this manner they bee also spirit and life, but not unto thee.*

* *Quid est, spiritus & vita sunt? Respondet. Spiritaliter intelligenda sunt. Intellexisti spiritaliter? spiritus & vita sunt. Intellexisti carnaliter? etiam sic spiritus & vita sunt, sed tibi non sunt.*

13. And upon that the *Capernaites* and some of the Lords Disciples were scan-

scandalized, and said that these words were an hard saying, he saith unto them, * What and if ye shall see then the Sonne of man ascend where he was before? Which words Saint *Austin* in the same Treatise explaineth thus, *What meeteth that? Thereby he resolveth that which had moved them. They thought he would give them his body, but he saith unto them that he would ascend up to heaven, to wit, whole and entire. When ye have seene the sonne of man ascending where he was before, certainely then at le ſt shall ye see that he giveth not his body as ye thinke. Then at the least shall ye understand that his grace is not consumed with biting.*

* *Illi putabant tum erogaturum corpus suum, ille autem dixit se ascensurum in cœlum, utique integrum. Cum videritis Filium hominis ascendentem ubi erat prius, certe vel tunc videbitis, quia non eo modo quo putatis erogat corpus suum. Certe vel tunc intelligetis, quia gratia ejus non consumitur morsibus.*

CHAP.

## CHAP. III.

*That the Romane Church, by this doctrine, depriveth the People of Salvation.*

THat which grieves our Adversaries most, in all this discourse of the Lord, is this clause of the 53 Verse, *Verily I say unto you, Except ye eate the flesh of the sonne of man, and drinke his blood, ye have no life in you.* For if by these words Christ doe speake of the participation of the Sacrament, it followes that the People of the *Roman* Church, whom they have deprived of the cup, shall have no life, and are lost eternally: for they drinke not Christs blood. To say, as *Bellarmin* doth, that the People takes the blood in the Hoste, is to say just nothing. For Christ commandeth not onely to take his blood, but also commandeth to drinke it. If he speaketh of the Sacrament, hee commandeth men not onely to be partakers of his blood, but also declareth the kind and manner

manner how he will have them to participate thereof; for, *to drinke*, is the kinde and manner of participating thereof. Briefly, he commandeth to drinke. But to eate a dry Hoste or wafer, is not to drinke. That if to eate, is to drinke, the Priest drinketh twice in the Masse, once in taking the Hoste, and another time in taking the Cup. Vnto which the common sense contradicteth: and Pope *Innocent* the third too, in his fourth Booke of the Mysteries of the Masse, Chapter. 21. *Neither is the blood drunke* (saith he) *under the species of the bread, nor the body eaten under the species of the wine*. Here then our Adversaries do forge an absurd figure, whereby *to drinke* signifieth *to eate*. Everywhere else they doe distinguish *eating* from *drinking*, but here they confound them as if they were all one. Indeede to eate and to drinke, taken in a spirituall sense, signifieth one and the same thing. But when the question is of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and of eating the bread, and drinking the Chalice, to eate and to drinke are different things. That if to eate the Hoste, be to drinke so to drinke the Cup, shall be to eate the Cup. And if drinking bee taken

figu

figuratively, why not also the word eating?

Here the truth is so strong, that *Vasquez* the Jesuite sticks not to dispute with might and maine against *Bellarmin*, who saith that the Lord commandeth only the perception of his blood, but not the manner of participating therunto. * *I do not approve* (saith he) *of this answer, because the words of the Lord have not only reference unto the thing that is taken, but to the manner of taking it. For to eate, and to drink, if the words be taken properly, cannot agree with any species whatsoever. For the blood is not said to be drunk under the species of the bread, no more than the body is eaten under the species of the wine,* as Innocent *the third observeth very well in his 4 Book chap. 21.*

* Vasquez in III. partem, Tomo 3. Disp. 206 num 50. *Hoc responsum mihi non probatur, quia verba Domini non tantum referuntur ad rem sumptam, sed ad modum sumendi eam. Nam manducare & bibere, si verba proprie usurpentur, cuivis speciei convenire non possunt; neque enim sanguis sub specie panis bibi dicitur: sicut neque corpus sub specie vini manducari, ut optime notat* Innocent. III lib. 4. de Mysteriis Missæ, *qui mvis sumi dicatur. Christus autem præcipit ut bibamus.*

And he addeth a thing very considerable, to wit, that from this answer of *Bellarmin*, who will have this word, *drinking*, to bee taken improperly, it

will

will follow that in the whole chapter there ſhall not be a word ſpoken of the Cup.

*Salmeron* another Ieſuite, is of the ſame opinion, ſaying, * that *he that drinketh not, drinketh not the blood, though he do take the fleſh and blood.*

* Salmer. Tom. 9. Tract 24. *Qui non bibit, non bibit ſanguinam, licet carnē et ſanguinē ſumat.*

But the ſame Ieſuites that conteſt againſt their own fellows, bring no better things themſelves. They ſay that when Chriſt ſaid, *Except ye drink my blood, ye have no life in you*, he bindeth the people to drink the Cup, and that they drink it indeed, in as much as the Prieſt drinketh for the people, and repreſenteth the whole Church when he drinketh. By this reaſon, the People might as wel forbeare eating, and be contented that the Prieſt ſhould eate for them. For the commandement for eating, in this place, is not more expreſſe than that of drinking. By the ſame meanes, when Chriſt commands the People to beleeve in him, the people may diſpenſe themſelves from beleeving in Chriſt, ſaying, it ſufficeth that the Prieſt beleeve for others, for he repreſenteth the whole Church: In a word, it is an impious temerity and preſumption to adde out of ones owne authority unto the words of the Lord, whole

whole clauses, yea absurd clauses, as if Christ had said, *Except ye drink my blood your own selves, or by another, ye shall have no life in you.*

With the like licence they say that when Christ said, *Except ye eate my flesh AND drinke my blood*, this *AND* must be turned into *OR*, and that Christs meaning was to have said, *Except ye eat my flesh, or drink my blood.* If it may bee lawfull to change thus the words of the Lord, there is no law in the Scripture from which a man may not dispence himselfe. When the Law of God commands one to love God and his Neighbour, one may by the same reason say, that the Law meaneth that one must love God or his Neighbour: And when the Law saith *Honor thy Father and thy Mother*, it meaneth that one must honor his Father or his Mother, and that it is enough to honor either of them. Adde withall that by this depravation of the Lords Words, it followes that the people may drink the Cup without eating the Hoste, since it sufficeth to do either of them.

CHAP.

will follow that in the whole chapter there shall not be a word spoken of the Cup.

*Salmeron* another Iesuite, is of the same opinion, saying, * that *he that drinketh not, drinketh not the blood, though he do take the flesh and blood.*

* Salmer. Tom. 9. Tract 24. *Qui non bibit, non bibit sanguinem, licet carnē et sanguinē sumat.*

But the same Jesuites that contest against their own fellows, bring no better things themselves. They say that when Christ said, *Except ye drink my blood, ye have no life in you*, he bindeth the people to drink the Cup, and that they drink it indeed, in as much as the Priest drinketh for the people, and representeth the whole Church when he drinketh. By this reason, the People might as wel forbeare eating, and be contented that the Priest should eate for them. For the commandement for eating, in this place, is not more expresse than that of drinking. By the same meanes, when Christ commands the People to beleeve in him, the people may dispense themselves from beleeving in Christ, saying, it sufficeth that the Priest beleeve for others, for he representeth the whole Church. In a word, it is an impious temerity and presumption to adde out of ones owne authority unto the words of the Lord, whole

whole clauses, yea absurd clauses, as if Christ had said, *Except ye drink my blood your own selves, or by another, ye shall have no life in you.*

With the like licence they say that when Christ said, *Except ye eate my flesh AND drinke my blood*, this *AND* must be turned into *OR*, and that Christs meaning was to have said, *Except ye eat my flesh, or drink my blood.* If it may bee lawfull to change thus the words of the Lord, there is no law in the Scripture from which a man may not dispence himselfe. When the Law of God commands one to love God and his Neighbour, one may by the same reason say, that the Law meaneth that one must love God or his Neighbour: And when the Law saith *Honor thy Father and thy Mother*, it meaneth that one must honor his Father or his Mother, and that it is enough to honor either of them. Adde withall that by this depravation of the Lords Words, it followes that the people may drink the Cup without eating the Hoste, since it sufficeth to do either of them.

CHAP.

## CHAP. IV.

*That the principall D[illegible] Roman Church, [illegible] themselves do agree [illegible] point; and [illegible] S. John nothing [illegible] the spirituall [illegible] that those that [illegible] speake with incertitu[illegible]*

IN this controversie [illegible] for us, and a great [illegible] Romish Doctors, [illegible] in the 6 of S. John, [illegible] the Eucharist not [illegible] Christ by the mouth [illegible] that Christ speaketh [illegible] manducation by Faith [illegible] Such is the opinion of [illegible] III, and of *Pius* II, called [illegible] *vius* afore he came to [illegible] * of *Bonaventure*, *Cajetan*, [illegible]

* Bonavé. in 4. Dist. 9 art. 1, q. 2. Cajet. in 6. Iohannis. Cusanus epist. 7. ad Bohemos. [illegible] in 4. Sentent. q. 2, art. 3. Durant. Rationali [illegible] 4. c. 41. n. 40. Lindanus Panopliæ l. 4. c. 18. [illegible] articulorum 15. Lovanensium. Iansen. Con[illegible] 26. Matthæi & 6. Iohannis. Valdensis Tomo 1 [illegible] Hessel. de communione sub utrraque specie.

Cap. 46.

## CHAP. IV.

*That the principall Doctors of the Roman Church, yea the Popes themselves do agree with us in this point: and hold that in the 6. of S. Iohn nothing is spoken but of the spirituall Manducation, and that those that contradict them, do speake with incertitude.*

IN this controversie we have the Popes for us, and a great multitude of the Romish Doctors, who hold with us that in the 6 of S. *Iohn*, it is not spoken of the Eucharist nor of eating our Saviour Christ by the mouth of the body, but that Christ speaketh of the spirituall manducation by Faith in Christs death. Such is the opinion of Pope *Innocent* the III, and of *Pius* II, called *Æneas Sylvius* afore he came to the Papacy. Item * of *Bonaventure, Cajetan, Cusanus, De*

* Bonavē. in 4. Dist. 9 art. 1. q. 2. Cajet. in 6. Iohannis. Cusanus epist. 7. ad Bohemos. Petrus de Alliaco in 4. Sentent. q. 2. art. 3. Durant. Rationali divinor. Offic. lib. 4. c. 41. n. 40. Lindanus Panopliæ l. 4. c. 18. Tapper. in explic. articulorum 15. Lovanensium Iansen. Concord. c. 54. Ferus in 26. Matthæi & 6 Iohannis. Valdensis Tomo 2 de Sacram. c. 91 Hessel. de communione sub utraque specie.

*Alliaco*

Miaco, Cardinals, Item of Durandus Episcopus Mimatensis, Gabriel Biel, Hessel one of the Doctors of the Councell of Trente, Lindanus, Ruardus Tapperus, Iansenius Bishop of Gand, Ferus a Diuine of Maguntia, Valdensis, and many others. Among others, Gabriel Biel in his 36 Lesson upon the Canon of the Masse, saith, that the Doctors hold with a common consent that in the 6 of S. Iohn no mention is made but of the spirituall manducation. But for brevity sake it shall suffice to produce the places of the two forenamed Popes.

Pope Innocent 3. in the 14. chap. of his fourth Book of the Mysteries of the Masse hath these words: * The Lord speaketh of the spirituall manducation, saying, Except ye eate the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. In this manner, the good only do eate the body of Christ.

A learned Pope is a very rare thing. Yet of Pius II. one may say that he was one of the learndest of his age. The same Pius in his 130 Epistle to Cardinall Carviall, disputing against the Bohemians, speaketh thus: a The sense of the Gospell of

* De spirituali manducatione Dominus ait, Nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis, et biberitis ejus sanguinem, &c. Hoc modo corpus Christi soli boni comedunt.

a Sed non est in Evangelio lohannis sensus quem sibi ascribitis. Non bibitio Sacramentalis ibi præscribitur, sed spiritualis insinuatur.

*John is not such as you ascribe unto it. For there it is not commanded to drink at the Sacrament: But a manner of spirituall drinking is taught.* And a little after, *The Lord by these words declareth in that place the secret mysteries of the spirituall drinke, and not of the carnall, when he saith, It is the Spirit that quickneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: and again, The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life. Wilt thou know openly that the Evangelist speaketh of the spirituall manducation which is made by Faith? Consider that what the Lord saith in the words HEE THAT EATETH AND DRINKETH, are words of the present tense and not of the future. At that very instant therefore that the Lord was speaking, there were some that did eate him, and drink him.* And yet the Lord had not suffered as yet, neither was the Sacrament instituted.

*Thomas Aquinas*, learned the Angelicall Doctor, was a great worshipper of Popes; * so far as to accuse Christ of importunity, for askinghis Vicar *Peter*

* Thom. Opusculo 21. c. 10.

*Dominus utitur in Iohanne quadam interrogationis importunitate quærens à suo successore, beato Petro, quod si ipsum diligit, gregem pascat.*

thrice,

thrice, *Loveſt thou mee?* For which likewiſe the Pope canonized him and made him a Saint after his death. This man, though a great defender of Tranſubſtantiation, yet nevertheleſſe upon this point of the manducation whereof Chriſt ſpeaketh in the 6 of S. *John*, ſpeaketh thus in his 7 Leſſon upon theſe words, *Except ye eate my fleſh, ye have no life in you.* * *If this* (ſaith he) *be referred to the ſpirituall manducation, this ſentence is without all doubt. For that man eateth ſpiritually the fleſh of Chriſt and drinketh his blood, that is partaker of the unity of the Church, which is effected through love, &c. But if that hath reference to the Sacramentall manducation, there is ſome doubt in that which is ſaid; Except yee eate my fleſh, ye have no life in you.*

* *Sihæc ſententia referatur ad ſpiritualem manducationem, nullam dubitationem habet ſententia, &c. Si vero ad Sacramētalem, dubiū habet quod dicitur.*

But in this latter age the greateſt part of the Romiſh Doctors, eſpecially the Jeſuites, have forſaken this opinion, generally received in the Church of *Rome* in former Ages, and have contemned the authority of the fore-alleadged Popes. Their opinion is, that in the 51 verſe of the 6 chap. of S. *Iohn*, Chriſt beginneth to ſpeake of the Sacramentall manducation which is made by the corporall mouth: but that whatſoe-

ver is said before, is to be understood of the spirituall manducation. As when Christ saith in the 33, 35, & 50 verses *that he is the bread come down from heaven.* And *that hee is the bread of life.* And that *whosoever believeth on him, shall never thirst.* And *that he is the bread come down from heaven, whereof whosoever eateth, hee shall not die.* In all these places they grant that it is spoken of a manner of eating and drinking that is spirituall, and will have nothing there to be spoken of the bread of the Eucharist, but do take all these words figuratively. A doctrine truly full of absurdity, and which destroyes and overthroweth it selfe. For what boldnesse is it to forge in the sequell or prosecution of one and the same discourse, two kinds of manducation, and by a Master-like authority, to will that one part of the chapter be understood figuratively, and the other simply, since they all be the same kind of speeches, and that the same exposition may bee brought both to the one and to the other?

The Councell of *Trente* was mightily pestered about that; for after this matter had been tossed a long time and disputed upon at the Councell, the Prelats seeing the

the new Doctors were contrary unto the old, yea even to the Popes, and that the new ones besides did not agree among themselves, would determine nothing therein, and left the thing undecided, as *Salmeron* the Jesuite, who was present at that Councell, doth testifie. *The Synode* *(saith he) *would not then determine namely which is the propereſt and naturall ſenſe of theſe words of Christ in S. Iohn, becauſe of the variety of Interpretations of the holy Fathers and Doctors that were brought on both ſides.* Yet it was there principally, that the infallible perfection of the Pope and of the Councell should have been displayed, being a matter of so great importance. And yet to this very day the Popes have determined nothing upon that, nor condemned those that are of a contrary mind to the Jesuits.

*Salmer. Tom 8. Tract. 23. *Etsi noluerit Synodus nunc illo tempore decernere, quis esset maxime proprius & germanus verborum illorum Christi ſenſus apud Iohannem, propter varias ſanctorum Patrum et Doctorum interpretationes in utramque partem allatas*, &c.

## CHAP. V.

*Reasons of our Adversaries for to prove that in the sixth chap. of Saint Iohn it is spoken of the manducation by the mouth of the Body.*

BUt let us see how the Doctors of this Age dispute against their Popes, Cardinals and Prelates, and goe about to prove that in the 6 of S. *Iohn* is spoken of the manducation by the mouth of the body in the Eucharist.

1. They say that Christ speaketh in the future, saying, *The bread that I will give*, as speaking of a manducation that was not yet. I answer that he speaketh also in the present, saying, *I am the bread come down from Heaven. And hee that eateth thereof, shall not die.* They themselves would laugh, if from that the Lord saith in the future, *Whosoever shall beleeve and shall be Baptised, shall be saved*, I should inferre that before Christ spake these words, none beleeved, none were Baptised, none were saved. Moreover, when

when Christ speaketh in the future, saying, *The bread that I will give*, he hath regard to his future death, which is the true food of our Soules.

2. They say also that if this sixth chapter of S. *John* were not taken and understood of the manducation by the mouth of the body: it would follow that S. *John* did not speake at all of the Eucharist. *Stapleton*, one of the most furious Adversaries, answers for us: S. *John* (saith he) * *writes nothing of the Eucharisticall Supper, because the other three Evangelists had fully written of it before.* S. *John* wrote long after the other Evangelists, and did only insist upō such things as the others had omitted. He did not put in his Gospel the history of the Lords Conception and Birth, nor of his Temptation in the Wilderness, nor of his Baptisme, nor of his Transfiguration in the Mount

* Stapl. Promptuar. Cathol. Serm. 1. Hebdom. Sanctæ. *Iohannes de tertia & Euchar sti. cæcæna nihil quidem scribit, eo quod cæteri tres Evangelistæ ante eum eam plene descripsissent.*

3. They adde that Christ doth distinguish the eating from drinking, for to designe the two *species* of the Eucharist. To that I answer, that Christ speakes of eating and drinking, for to give us to understand that wee have in him and in his death a full and entire spirituall nourishment. In the 55 chap. of *Isaiah*, 1. v.

God

God inviteth the hungry and the thirsty to eate and to drink. And in the 22 of S. *Luke*, 30 ver. Christ saith: *I appoint unto you a Kingdome, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that yee may eate and drink at my table in my Kingdom.* In these places, our Adversaries do acknowledge that to eate and to drink, signifies one and the same thing, and that they are taken in a spirituall sense.

4. But (say they) it is neither fitting nor convenient that Christ should have used so many figures, and spoken in such dark tearmes, when he might have spoken plainely. Wee have already shewed that Christs ordinary use was to speake unto the Jews by figures and similitudes, and that the Capernaites, objecting unto him the bread of Heaven given by *Moses*, gave him occasion to speak so. That if our adversaries do so much dislike figures Why do they say that from the 27 verse this chap. to the 51. the Lord speaks of the spirituall manducation, and useth figurative words? Why will they have that when Christ said, *Except ye drink my blood: by drinking*, he understandeth *eating?* That if the question be touching the difficulty, is there any thing in the World harder to conceive and to beleeve, than

this

this doctrine, whereby they will have Christ to have eaten his own flesh, and that an humane body be whole and entire in every crum of the host, and be remote and divided from it selfe, and that a Priest should make a God with a few words, and that this god must run the risque and be subject to be eaten by Rats and Mice, and carried away by the wind?

5. Yet (say they) Christ said, *My flesh is meat indeed*. Now, this word *truly* or *indeed*, excludes all figure: For they esteem that figurative words are not true. If it be so, why do they themselves put in so many figures? Why will they have this word, *bread*, to be taken figuratively, and the word *drinking*, to signifie eating? They must then say that when Christ in the 15 of S. *Iohn*, 1 ver. said, *I am the true Vine*, he spake falsly: or else they must needs grant that this word, *true*, excluds not the figure. So in the 8 to the *Heb.* 2. v. the Apostle calleth Paradise *the true* Tabernacle. It is a common thing to say that God is the true Sun of the Soule, and that evill examples are truly the plague and contagion of the mind. All that in figurative tearmes, and yet true, and wherein the word *true* excludes not the figure.

6. What they do adde, is not a whit better.

better. Christ (say they) used an oath, saying, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eate the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.* But it is not convenient (say they) to use figures in an oath. What will they say then to these places, *Verily verily, I say unto you, that he that entreth not by the doore into the sheepfold, the same is a theife and a robber,* Iohn 10. 1. And a little after, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, that I am the doore of the sheep.* And in S. *Matth.* 18. 18. *Verily I say unto you, that whatsoever ye shal binde on earth, shall be bound in Heaven.* And *Iohn* 3. 5. *Verily verily, I say unto you, Except a man be borne of the water and of the spirit, &c.* Where we have the same oath with figurative words. What more? the same verse which they alleadge, *Verily verily, I say unto you, Except ye eate my flesh and drink my blood, ye have no life in you,* is the same verse in which they will have *drinking* to signifie *eating*. And in the same chap. ver. 32. Christ calleth himselfe *the true bread:* wherein our Adversaries do acknowledge a figure. To let passe that the word Amen is not an oath, but a simple and strong affirmation.

CHAP.

## CHAP. VI.

### Testimonies of the Fathers.

IT is good upon this point to heare the ancient Fathers. S. *Austin* shal march in the forefront. In his Book of Christian Doctrine, chap. 16.* *when the Lord saith, Except ye eate the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his blood, yee have no life in your selves, it seemes that he commands some great crime or haynous offence. It is then a figure, that commandes to communicate unto the Lords Passion, and sweetly and profitably to put in remembrance that Christs flesh was crucified and wounded for us.* Our Adversaries, to cleare themselves and avoyd the force of this place, do make long discourses, and finde there are figures in these words, *Except yee eate, &c.* To wit that in the Eucharist, Christs body is not eaten by peece-meales as the flesh of the Shambles. But they come not neare the point.

* *Nisi manducaveritis (inquit) carnem filii hominis, &c facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere. Figura ergo est, præcipiens passioni Dominus esse communicandum, & suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit.*

For

better. Christ (say they) used an oath, saying, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eate the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.* But it is not convenient (say they) to use figures in an oath. What will they say then to these places, *Verily verily, I say unto you, that he that entreth not by the doore into the sheepfold, the same is a theife and a robber,* Iohn 10. 1. And a little after, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, that I am the doore of the sheep.* And in S. *Matth.* 18. 18. *Verily I say unto you, that whatsoever ye shal binde on earth, shall be bound in Heaven.* And *Iohn* 3. 5. *Verily verily, I say unto you, Except a man be borne of the water and of the spirit, &c.* Where we have the same oath with figurative words. What more? the same verse which they alleadge, *Verily verily, I say unto you, Except ye eate my flesh and drink my blood, ye have no life in you,* is the same verse in which they will have *drinking* to signifie *eating*. And in the same chap. ver. 32. Christ calleth himselfe *the true bread*: wherein our Adversaries do acknowledge a figure. To let passe that the word Amen is not an oath, but a simple and strong affirmation.

CHAP.

## CHAP. VI.

### *Testimonies of the Fathers.*

IT is good upon this point to heare the ancient Fathers. S. *Austin* shal march in the forefront. In his Book of Christian Doctrine, chap. 16.* *when the Lord saith, Except ye eate the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his blood, yee have no life in your selves, it seemes that he commands some great crime or haynous offence. It is then a figure, that commandes to communicate unto the Lords Passion, and sweetly and profitably to put in remembrance that Christs flesh was crucified and wounded for us.* Our Adversaries, to cleare themselves and avoyd the force of this place, do make long discourses, and finde there are figures in these words, *Except yee eate, &c.* To wit that in the Eucharist, Christs body is not eaten by peece-meales as the flesh of the Shambles. But they come not neare the point.

* *Nisi manducaveritis (inquit) carnem filii hominis, &c facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere. Figura ergo est, præcipiens passioni Domini esse communicandum, & suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit.*

For

For Saint *Austin* saith not onely that it is a figure, but he declares also how that figure is to be taken and expounded; to wit, that to eate Christs flesh, is to meditate and call to remembrance with delight, that Christ his flesh was crucified for us. Which is an expositon our Adversaries doe not allow.

[a] *Vt quid paras dentes et ventrem? Crede et manducasti.*

[b] *Credere in eum, hoc est manducare panem vivum. Qui credit in eum manducat, invisibiliter saginatur, quia et invisibiliter renascitur.*

[c] *Hinc itaque sibi et potius societatem vult intelligi corporis et membrorum suorum, quod est sancta Ecclesia in prædestinatis, &c.*

The same Father upon the 98 Psalme. *Understand spiritually what I have said unto you, Ye shall not eate this body that ye see, and drink that blood that shall be shed by those that shall crucifie me. I have commended unto you a sacred sign which being understood spiritually, shall quicken and vivifie you.*

We have in this Father a long exposition of the sixth Chapter of Saint *John* in the 25. 26. & 27 Treatise upon Saint *John*: In the 25 Tract he saith, [a] *This* (viz. to beleeve) *is to eate the meate that perisheth not. Why doest thou make ready thy teeth and thy belly? Beleeve, and thou hast eaten.* And in the 26 Treatise, [b] *To beleeve in him, is to eate the living bread. He that beleeves in him, eateth him; he is fed invisibly, because he is regenerated invisibly.* And in the same place, [c] *By this meate and drinke Christ*

wil

*will have to be understood the society of his body and members, which is the Church of the Predestinate.* This Father was so far from beleeving that Christ was eaten even by the mouth of the body, that by this meate he will have the Church to be understood. Whence also he addeth, [d] *This meate and drinke which makes such as doe take it, immortall and incorruptible, is the fellowshippe of Saints where there shall bee peace and perfect unitie.*

And in the same place, [e] *That, therefore, is to eate this meate and to drinke this drinke, to dwell in Christ and to have him dwelling in us. And therefore he that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, doubtlesse he eates not spiritually his flesh and drinkes not his blood, how be it that carnally and visibly he presseth with his teeth the sacred signe of Christs body and blood.* In summe, in three long Treatises containing many pages, wherein this good Doctor expoundeth the sixth Chapter of Saint *John*, there is

[d] *Hoc veraciter non præstat nisi iste cibus & potus qui eos à quibus sumitur, immortales & incorruptibiles facit, i. societas ipsa Sanctorum, &c.*

[e] *Hoc est ergo manducare illam escam & bibere illum potum in Christo manere, & illum manentem in se habere. Ac per hæc qui non manet in Christo, & in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nec manducat spiritaliter carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, licet carnaliter & visibiliter premat dentibus Sacramentum corporis & sanguinis Christi.*

not

not one word of eating by the mouth of the body the Lords flesh crucified for us. Which expositiō was so disliked by Cardinall du *Perron*, that he speaketh contemptibly of these Tractates of Saint *Austin* upon Saint *John*, [f] saying that they be popular Sermons made before all kindes of persons, to whom he would not declare openly the Churches beleife.

[f] In his Booke against the King of Great Britaine. In the Treatise of the Eucharist

*Tertullian* in the 37 Chapter of his Booke of the Resurrection, expounding these words, *The flesh profiteth nothing: The sense* (saith hee) *must bee addressed according to the subject whereof he speaketh.* [g] *For because they esteemed his words to be harsh and intolerable, as though he had determined to give them truely his flesh to eate that he might render spirituall the state of salvation, he said before, It is the spirit that quickneth: Then he addeth, The flesh profiteth nothing, to wit for to vivifie.*

[g] *Quia durum & intolerabilem existimaverunt sermonem ejus. quasi vere carnem suam illis edendam determinasset ut in spiritu disponeret statum salutis, præmisit, Spiritus est qui vivificat. Tum addit, Caro non prodest quicquam; ad vivificandum scilicet.*

And there againe, [h] *The word was made flesh, and by consequent, for to have life, it must be desired, and devoured by the eare, and ruminated by the understanding, and digested by faith.*

[h] *Quia & sermo caro erat factus, proinde in causam vitæ appetendus, & devorandus auditu, et ruminandus intellectu, et fide digerendus.*

And

And a little after, *The Lord had a little afore declared that his flesh is the heavenly bread,* [l] *urging altogether by allegory taken from necessary meates the remembrance of the Fathers.*

*Clemens Alexandrinus* in his second Booke *De Pedagogo*, Chapter 6. [k] *Hee said, eate my flesh and drinke my blood, propoundiog by an allegoric the evidence of the faith, and the drinke of the promise.*

And a little after, [l] *Hee calleth the holy Spirit flesh by allegory. For the flesh was created by him, and the blood signifies the Word.*

*Origene* upon the *Leviticus*, in the seventh Booke: *Know that these things writen in the divine volumes, are figures, and understand them as spirituall, and not as carnall. For if you receive them as carnall, they hurt you in stead of nourrishing you. For in the Gospells there is a letter which killeth him that observes not the things that are spoken spiritually.* [m] *For if thou*

[l] *Vrgens usquequaq; per allegoriã necessariorũ pabulorũ memoriam Patrũ, &c.*

[m] Φάγετε μου τὰς σάρκας εἰπών, καὶ πεῶτε μου τοῦ αἷμα ἐναργὲς τὴν πίστεως καὶ τὸς παγγελίας τοῦ ποτηρίου ἀλληγορῶν.

[n] Σάρκα ἐμῖν τοῦ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἁγίου ἀλληγορεῖ.

[l] *Si secundum literam sequeris hoc ipsum quod dictum est, Nisi manducaveritis carnem meam et biberitis sanguinem meum, hæc litera occidit.*

*takest according to the letter that which is said, Except ye eate my flesh and drinke my blood, that letter killeth.*

The Commentary upon the Psalmes, attributed to Saint *Hierome*, upon the 44 Psalme. [n] *When the Lord saith, He that eateth not my flesh, &c. though that may be understood in mysterie, yet to speake more truely, the body and blood of Christ is the word of the Scriptures, and the heavenly doctrine.* And a little after, [o] *The flesh and blood of Christ is powred into our eares.*

[n] *Quando dicit, Qui non manducaverit carnem meam et biberit sanguinem meum, licet in mysterio possit intelligi, tamen verius corpus Christi et sanguis ejus sermo Scripturarum est.*

[o] *Corpus et sanguis ejus in auribus nostris fundi tur-*

It is true that some places may bee found in ancient Fathers that apply and fit the words of the sixth Chapter of Saint *John* to the Eucharist, because the manducation of the Sacrament serves to helpe the spirituall manducation, and there is some analogie betweene these two. Adde moreover that we have proved already by a multitude of places of Ancient Fathers, that when they say that in the Eucharist wee eate the flesh or the body of Christ, they meane to speake of another flesh and another bodie than that which was crucified for us, which is called Christs bodie because of the mysticall union of the bread with Christ, and because the

signes

signes take the name of the things signified.

Vpon this, the words of Pope *Pius* the second, are notable in his 130 Epistle. *Yee must not wonder (saith he) if some Doctors speaking of the Sacramentall communion, and counselling it unto the People, doe imply Saint* John *his words. For it doth not follow from thence that it bee the true and proper sense of that place, but by some resemblance and agreeable reason, this sense is rather drawne then led. And it is lawfull for the Doctors, speaking after the manner of Orators, to use sometimes figures and translations, so that often times speaking of the signe, they passe unto the thing signified.*

? *Sed nec moveri debetis, quod nonnulli Doctores de communione Sacramentali loquentes, illamque populo suadentes lohannis verba recipiunt. Neque enim propterea illius loci vel talis verus est ex proprius intellectus; sed ex quadam similitudine consonantique ratione, trahitur inde magis sensus quàm ducitur, &c.*

## CHAP. VII.

*Impiety of* Salmeron *the Jesuite, and of* Peter Charron. *And of* Bellarmins *fourewomen inclosed in one sute of clothes. That by this doctrine, Christ hath not a true body in the Sacrament.*

Superstition and Atheisme are verie neere neighbours, and the one leadeth unto the other. For frantick superstition intangles the minde with extravagant conceits, that expose Religion to laughter, and make men to thinke that Religion is a shop of fables, and a meere imagination. Whence it comes to passe that those that take upon them to defend Superstition, let goe very often certaine words of impietie, whereby they profane the mysteries, and scoffe at their owne Religion under colour of defending it.

*Salmeron* the Jesuite, and Doctor *Charron* gives us an example thereof. This

Jesuite in the IX Tome and 26 Treatise, for to represent the manner and the end for which Christ gives us his flesh to eate, saith that Christ hath done as men doe, who for to kindle and inflame a woman with love, doe give her an amorous potion or morsell, and that just so Christ in the Eucharist gives to his Church *Panis buccellam sanctè benedictam & incantatam, a morsell of bread holily blessed and INCHANTED for to transport her with his love.* *Sub finem Tractatus.*

*Charron* hath followed him, but with an addition that declares what are the ingredients of those philters or amorous potions, to wit that there eneers in them something of the substance of the Lover, which substance is a thing not fit to be named. In his eighth Discourse of the Eucharist, after hee hath said that God comes downe in the forme of bread and wine: and that to dance for to serue God, is lesse strange then what is done in the Masse: a little after, he declares how Christ communicates himselfe unto men in the Eucharist, to wit, that he allures and intices them with a dainty and delicious bit. *Love* (saith he) *is so ingenious and inventive, that for to win and allure the heart and will of o-*

*thers, it hath found out a device to imploy inchanted morsels, philters and amorous potions, and to make them to be taken and drunke by those of whom one desires to be loved, in which morsells or potions enters some thing of the Lover or Suitor. Thus it seemes that God for to draw and allure unto himselfe the heart and love of the Church, would present a bit or potion made of his substance in this Sacrament, the philter and amorous drinke of all Christians, the dainty and delicious bit for to draw and allure them unto himselfe.* Doubtlesse this man jeasted and intended to make the world laugh, for he could not expect that men should beleeve him.

Bellar. lib. 3. de Euchar. cap 7 §. ad tertiũ *Potest fieri ut redigatur ad locum unitatis, ita ut quatuor homines occupent locum unius hominis.*

I know not whither *Bellarmin* did mock or jeast, when for to prove that a body may be in severall places at once, hee saith that it is possible that foure men hold no more place than one of the foure alone, and that all foure fill up but one place. Take me a man clothed with a sute of clothes that fits close and is made just to his body, *Bellarmin* saith it is possible for these foure men to be contained in the same sute of clothes, without being made larger, and the men never a whit the lesse. If that be possible for foure, it is also possible for ten, yea

yea for a hundred, yea for a thousand: so that all the men of the World shall be contained in a single doublet. But if of these foure men in this little doublet, one be sitting, the other lying, and the other standing: If one of them embrace the other, and by consequent is out of the other, they shall not be in one and the same place. If they speake together and looke one upon another, the one shall be the object of the others eyes, and therefore shall not bee in one and the selfe same place. Truly I thinke this Jesuite, propounding such things, and shutting up a whole Common-wealth in a doublet, had a minde to deride his owne Religion. For by the same reason a man may have both his eyes in one place, and not different of situation. By this meanes a man shall have two eyes, and shall have but one. And the parts of an humane body shall not be distinct, and the one shall not be out of the other. This our Adversaries doe by their Transubstantiation: as *Bellarmin* acknowledgeth, saying that *in the Eucharist Christ doth not exist after the manner of bodies: but rather after the manner of Spirits, since hee is whole in everie part.*

Bellar. lib. 1. de Euchar. c. 2. § Tertia. *Christus in Eucharistia non habet modum existendi corporum, sed potius spirituũ, cum sit totus in qualibet parte.*

It

It is false likewise, that according to the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, Christs body be in the Eucharist after the manner of Spirits. For when an Angell is present in any place, he is not present in a thousand others, severall places and is not far from himselfe and divided from himselfe, as they will have Christs body to bee in a million of severall places at one and the same time.

The same Jesuite in the third Booke and fifth chapter saith, * *that a Substance without quantity cannot bee tearmed flesh.* Whereupon it followes that Christs body under the Host is not flesh, for there is no quantity, since it is whole under every point that hath no quantity. Besides that the quantity of a body is a continued quantity. But Christs body in the Host is not one in continuity with that which is in Heaven sitting at the right hand of God the Father, since hee is farre and remote from it.

* §. *Ad hæc. Substantia sine quantitate caro dici non potest.*

Againe, he saith in the same place, * *That a body is nothing else but an extension in length, breath, and depth.* There-

* *Quid est corpus, nisi extentio in longitudinem, latitudinem, & profunditatem?*

fore

fore in the Sacrament there is no true body of Christ, since it hath no extension, no length, breadth and depth: As he saith himselfe in the second chapter of his first Book, *Christs body in the Eucharist hath no extension.*

I have wondred many times, seeing that our Adversaries hold that Christ remaines in the stomach of the Communicants untill the species be destroyed and consumed by the disgestion, why they do not give them hard bread and not of easie disgestion, that they might have Christ in them a longer time, rather then to give them such light Hosts or wafers, which are presently turned into a *Chyle* and disgested in an instant.

## CHAP. VIII.

Irregular Pagination.

*Substantia sine quantitate caro dici non potest.*

flesh. Whereupon it followes, that Christs body under the Hoſt is not flesh, for there is no quantity, ſince it is whole under every point that hath no quantity. Beſides that the quantity of a body is a continued quantity. But Chriſts body in the Hoſt is not one in continuity with that which is in Heaven ſitting at the right hand of God the Father, ſince hee is farre and remote from it.

Againe, he ſaith in the ſame place, * *That a body is nothing elſe but an extenſion in length, breath, and depth.* There-

* *Quid eſt corpus, niſi extentio in longitudinem, latitudinem, & profunditatem?*

fore

fore in the Sacrament there is no true
of Christ, since it hath no ex-
and depth:
cond chap-
body in the

times, seeing
that Christ
the Com-
be destroyed
gestion, why
bread and
they might
time, ra-
ch light Hosts
or wafers, which are presently tur-
ned into a *Chyle* and digested in an in-
stant.

## CHAP. VIII.

It is false likewise, that according to the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, Christs body be in the Eucharist after the manner of Spirits. For when an Angell is present in any place, he is not present in a thousand others severall places, and is not far from himselfe and divided from himselfe, as they will have Christs body to bee in a million of severall places at one and the same time.

The same Jesuite in the third Booke and fifth chapter saith, * *that a Substance without quantity cannot bee tearmed flesh.* Whereupon it followes, that Christs body under the Host is not flesh, for there is no quantity, since it is whole under every point that hath no quantity. Besides that the quantity of a body is a continued quantity. But Christs body in the Host is not one in continuity with that which is in Heaven sitting at the right hand of God the Father, since hee is farre and remote from it.

* §. *Ad hæc. Substantia sine quantitate caro dici non potest.*

Againe, he saith in the same place, * *That a body is nothing else but an extension in length, breath, and depth.* There-

* *Quid est corpus, nisi extentio in longitudinem, latitudinem, & profunditatem?*

fore

fore in the Sacrament there is no true body of Christ, since it hath no extension, no length, breadth and depth: As he saith himselfe in the second chapter of his first Book; *Christs body in the Eucharist hath no extension.*

I have wondred many times, seeing that our Adversaries hold that Christ remaines in the stomach of the Communicants untill the species be destroyed and consumed by the disgestion, why they do not give them hard bread and not of easie disgestion, that they might have Christ in them a longer time, rather then to give them such light Hosts or wafers, which are presently turned into a *Chyle* and disgested in an instant.

## CHAP. VIII.

## CHAP. VIII.

### *Of the progresse of this abuse, and by what meanes Satan hath established the Transubstantiation.*

UPon this matter, the opinions of men began to varie in the eight Age, wherein the controverse touching the adoration of Images was in its highe and force. For Satan at the same time did labour and busie himselfe to introduce and bring into the Church these two sorts of Idolatry.

In the yeere of our Lord 754, the Emperor *Constantin*, son to *Lisaurus*, called a Councell of his whole Empire at *Constantinople*, where 330 Bishops were present, that condemned the adoration of Images. Among other reasons that they bring, they exhort the people to be contented with those Images that Christ had instituted, having given in the holy Supper the bread and wine for Images and Figures of his body and blood.

blood. And speaking of the Eucharisticall bread, they say, * *Behold the image of this quickning body that is honorably presented.* And a little after, *The Lord commanded to set* [upon the table] *that image altogether chosen, to wit the substance of the bread, least Idolatry should creep in if it were represented in an humane forme.*

* *Ecce vivificantis illius corporis Imaginem.*

But few yeares after, the Empire being fallen into the hands of *Irenea*, an Idolatrous woman, and who did put out the eyes of her own son, and ravished the Empire from him: this monster called another Councell at *Nice*, in the year 787. where she caused Images to be reestablished, and the worshipping of them to be commanded under paine of a curse. There likewise were condemned as abhominable, these foresaid clauses of the former Councell, whereby the bread and wine are called Images of the Lords body and blood. And it is the same Councell that declares, that Images are equivalent and of as much worth as the Gospell: and that an Image is better than Prayer: And that Angels are corporall: And that he that hath the least doubt whither Images must bee worshipped, is accursed. For certainly the spirit of Satan reigned in that pernicious

pernicious Councell. Wherefore also *Charles* the *Great*, who lived then, called another Councell at *Francksford*, *anno Domini* 794, in which that Councell of *Nice* was condemned as erroneous, by a generall consent: notwithstanding that Pope *Adrian* had approved that Councell, and made a Treatise in defense of it.

Whilest Satan bestirred himselfe thus in the East parts: the Roman Bishops on their side did labour in the West parts. For they did well perceive that these two things, to wit the adoration of the Sacrament, and the adoration of Images, would be of great use, and would serve much for the strengthning of their Empire, and encreasing of the dignity of the Romish Clergy. For the Pope taking out of the way the holy Scriptures from the eyes of the People, hath given them Images, which they call Ignorant mens Books, busying the eyes of the people, whilest he conveyed away the Word of God from them. And the opinio of the real presence of Christs body in the Eucharist, exalts the dignity and power of Priests, so far as to be able to make God with words, and to have Christ in their own power.

This

This abuse beginning to creepe in France, King *Charles* the *Bald*, about the yeere 870, made a commandement unto one *Bertram* a Priest, and as learned a man as these times did affoord, to compose and write a Book of this matter: which Book we have yet whole and extant at this day, wherein hee maintaines the true doctrine, and withstands stoutly and vigourously that opinion of the reall presence of the body of Christ under the species of the bread. For of Transubstantiation there was yet no speech of it. For which cause also *Bellarmine* in his first Book of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, first chap. puts this *Bertram* amongst the Hereticks. Who notwithstanding, in his time, lived with honor, and was neither troubled, nor received any rebuke or reprehension upon this subject. Of the same opinion were *Iohn Scotus* and *Druthmarus*, and others of the same time. And I make no doubt but many others with them have defended the same cause in writing: But the following ages, in which error prevailed, have abolished their writings, and it is marvel how this Book of *Bertram* could escape thus.

The tenth and eleventh Ages, are the

Ages

Ages wherein this error did strengthen it selfe most, in which neverthelesse God left not himselfe without testimony. For *Bruno* Bishop of *Angiers*, and after him (but more vigorously) *Berengarius*, his Arch-Deacon, taught and maintained openly that the bread and wine of the Eucharist were not the body of Christ, but the figure and remembrance of it: This *Berengarius* began to shew himselfe about the yeare of our Lord 1035. Against whom Pope *Victorius* 2. caused a Councel to be gathered at *Tours* about the yeare 1055. and foure yeeres after, *Nicholas* II. cited him to *Rome* to the Councel assembled for that effect, where *Berengarius* was forced to condemn his own doctrine, & submit himself to the Popes will. By the reading of that Councel, it appeares that there were in it many others of the same opinion of *Berengarius*. And *Leo* **Hostiensis* recordeth that none of those that were there present, could resist *Berengarius*. The forme of the abjuration prescribed unto him, is to be found in the Collections of the *Decrees* made by *Ivo Carnutensis*, and by *Gratian*, which forme is set down in absurde tearmes, and which the Church of *Rome* her selfe beleeves not. For they make him say, * that the bread

* Sigebert. ad annum 1051.

* Leo Hostiensis Chron. Casinensis li. 3. c. 35. *Et quem nullus valeret resistere, Albericus ideò evocatur.*

* Can. *Ego Berengar. Dist. 2. de Consecr.*

bread is the true body of Christ, and that Christs body is truely and sensibly handled and brused by the teeth of the Faithfull. But *Berengarius* being rid out of the hands of that Councell and returned back into *France*, protested against the violence offered unto him, and continued to teach the same doctrine till the yeere 1088. in which he died. Upon his tombe, *Hildebertus*, * who after was Bishop of *Mans*, made an honorable Epitaphe, wherein he tearmes him *the Prop and Support of the Church, the hope and the glory of the Clergy*. And *France, Germany, Italy* and *England*, were full of people that embraced his doctrine, as *William Malmesbury* testifies in the Book of his English Historie. *All France* (saith hee) *was full of his doctrine*. And *Matthew* of *Westminster* in the year 1087 * *Berengarius of Tours being fallen into heresie, had corrupted by his depravations almost all the French, Italians, and English.*

*Platina* in the life of *John* XV. speaks thus of *Berengarius*, *It is certain that Odilus Bishop of Clugni and Berengarius of Tours, men famous and renowned for do-*

* Hild. Epitaphio Berengar. apud Malmesburiensem. *Quem merito ut miratur semper mirabiliter orbis. Ille Berengarius non obiturus obit.*

*Quem sacræ fidei fastigia summa tenentem, &c.* Vide Baron. ad ann. 1088. § 21.

* *Eodem tempore Berengarius Turonensis in hæreticam lapsus pravitatem, omnes Gallos, Italos, Anglos, suis jam pene corruperat pravitatibus.*

Urine

*Divine and holinesse, were in great esteeme in that time.* Adde to this, that *Berengarius* distributed all his monies to the poore, and betooke himselfe to get his living with the labour of his hands.

*Guit alias Berengarius iste vir bonus, plenus eleemosynis, et humilitate, magnarum possessionum, qui omnia distribuit pauperum dispersit, &c.*

*Antoninus* Arch-Bishop of *Florence*, whom the Pope hath canonized and made a Saint, gives him this testimony in the 2. Tome of his Chronicles, Tit. 16 §. 20. *That Berengarius, was otherwise a good man, full of Almes deeds, and humility, and having great possessions and riches, which he distributed to the poore, and would have no woman to come before his eyes.*

About the latter end of *Berengarius* his life, lived *Gregory* the seventh, who entred into the Papacy in the yeare of our Lord 1073. called *Hildebrand* before he was Pope. This *Gregory* was suspected to incline to *Berengarius* his opinion. *Sigonius* in his 9 Book of the reigne of *Italy*, in the yeare 1080, recordeth that the Bishops of *Germany* assembled at *Brixina* in *Bavaria*, did call this *Gregory Veterem haretici Berengarii discipulum, an old disciple of Berengarius the heretick*, accusing him *of calling into question the Apostolicall Faith, touching the body and blood of the Lord.* And this a-

gree

grees with Cardinall *Benno*, Arch-Priest of the Cardinals who was very inward and familiar with the said *Gregory*, and who wrote his life: wherein hee saith that *Gregory* appointed a fast to three Cardinals, to the end God might shew whither of the two, to wit *Berengarius* or the Church of *Rome* had the rightest opinion. And there he relates that *John* Bishop of *Port* in a Sermon at S. *Peters* Church, did declare in presence both of Clergy and People, that *Gregory*, for to obtaine some divine answer, had in the presence of the Cardinals cast the holy Sacrament into the fire.

*Berengarius* being dead, he had many successors that maintained the same doctrine even to the time of *Petrus de Valdo*, of the City of *Lions*, whose disciples were named by their enemies, *Valdenses* and *Albigenses*: Of whose Religion and Confession of Faith, conformable to ours, hath been spoken before in the 21 chapter of the first Book, and shewed that their Churches remaine, even unto our times.

*Fasciculus rerum expetendarũ fol. 95.*

Furthermore, *John Wickl f* in *England*, in the yeere 1390. taught the same. Of whose doctrine contained in eighteen Articles, here is the first, *That the sub-*

*Iodocus Coccius Tom. II. lib. 6. de Eucharistia. fol. 602.*

*ſtance of the bread remaines after the Conſecration, and ceaſes not to be bread.*

Againſt the Faithfull that profeſſed this doctrine, the Pope ſtirred up Kings and Princes, and cauſed an incredible butchery to bee made of them, preaching the *Croiſadoe* againſt them, whereby hee gave the ſame ſpirituall graces unto thoſe that ſhould maſſacre them, as to thoſe that went into *Syria* againſt the *Saraſens*, for to reconquer Chriſts Sepulcher, to whom he gave the remiſſion of all their ſins, and a degree of glory above the ordinary, as may bee ſeene in the Bull of *Innocent* the third, placed at the end of the Councell of *Lateran*. The Earle of *Montfort*, having with him one *Dominicke*, author of the Order of the *Jacobins*, with an army of theſe croſſed ones, did maſſacre in a few moneths above two hundred thouſand of them.

And for to ſtrengthen and fortifie this abuſe, there was no ſpeeche in thoſe times but of miracles, coyned of purpoſe, tending to the worſhipping of Images, and eſtabliſhing of the reall preſence of Chriſts body in the Euchariſt,

rist. They gave out to the people that such an Image had sweated blood, that another had nodded his head. That a woodden Crucifix prickt in the side, had cast blood. That to an Image of the Virgin *Maries*, brought from *Damascus*, breasts of flesh were grown upon the wood. That in such a place the Host had appeared in the forme of a child, and an Angell by it, that did hacke him to peeces. That an Hoste, pricked by a Jew, had gushed out blood: and being cast into a great cauldron or kittle, was turned into a man, as is to be seene yet at this day in *Paris* represented upon the forefront or porche of the Church of the *Billetes*. The life of Saint *Anthonie* of *Padoua* saith, that he presented the consecrated Hoste to an Asse, which presently left eating of his Oates and worshipped the Hoste. [a] *Wedekindus* a Saxon Prince saw a child thrust into the mouth of the Communicants. [b] An Angell did present Christ in the Masse unto a Priest called *Plegils*, in the shape or forme of a childe, which he killed and imbraced with great courage. [c] A little Jewish boy comming by chance into the Church as he was playing, saw upon the Altar a little boy that was minced

This fable is recited by Fulgos. lib. 1. c. 6. And by Nauclerus Gener. 44

[a] Albertus Krantzius Metropol. lib. 1. ca. 9.

[b] *Paschasius Ratbertus de corpore & sanguine Domini* c. 14.

[c] Guil. Malmesbur. l. 3. cap 27.

minced and cut into ſmall peeces, and thruſt by ſmall lumps into the mouths of the Communicants. *Thomas Cantipratenſis* in his ſecond Booke of Miracles, Chapter 40, ſaith that at *Dowey*, in the yeare 1260. the conſecrated hoſt being fallen to the ground, riſed up againe of it ſelfe, and pearched it ſelfe upon the cloth wherewith the Prieſt did wipe his hands, in the ſhape or forme of a fine little boy, who inſtantly became a tall man, having a crowne of thornes upon his head, and two drops of blood running downe from his forehead on both ſides of his noſe. *Jodocus Coccius* collected about one hundred of ſuch miracles. For in *Berengarius* his time ſuch miracles were very rife and frequent. *Matthew Paris* an Engliſh Hiſtorian, in the yeare of the Lord, 1247 relates that the *Templers* of the holy land ſent to *Henry* the third King of England, a little Chriſtall bottle full of the true blood of our Saviour Chriſt that he ſhed upon the Croſſe, which Criſtall bottle that ſilly King carried upon his noſe to Weſtminſter Church in Proceſſion a foot, clothed with an old ſleeveleſſe gowne. *Salmeron* the Jeſuite in the XI Tome and fifth Treatiſe, page 35. ſaith

Iodocus Coccius Theſaur. Tom. II. lib. 6. de Euchariſtia.

saith that at *Rome* in the Church of *Lateran* there is some of Christs blood kept. *Item* in the Church of Saint *Maximin* at *Rome*, which *Marie Magdalen* gathered up at the foote of the Crosse. There was also at Rochelle some kept, as the same Jesuite saith in the same place.

*Sigonius* in his fourth Booke of the reigne of *Italy*, * saith that in the yeare 804. was brought out of *Syria* to *Mantua*, a portion of the blood that ran out of the Image of a Crucifix, which did many miracles. And that the fame of it being come to *Charles* the *Great*, he intreated by letters Pope *Leo*, to enquire of the truth of the matter: And that the said Pope having knowne and perceived the truth of the thing, wrote to *Charle-maine* touching the same. And in the eighth Booke, in the yeare 1048. he saith that the inhabitants of *Mantua* having forgotten this blood, and knowing no more what it was, this blood beganne againe to doe miracles. *Vasquez* the Jesuite upon the 76 question of the third Part of *Thomas*, * saith that yet at this day there is in *Spaine* some of Christs blood kept in Reliques.

* *Forte sanguinis ex imagine crucifixi Salvatoris in Syria effusi portio delata Mantuam fuerat, &c.*

*Carolus Leonem Pontificem per literas obsecravit ut accurate horum miraculorum veritatem vellet explorare & compertam sibi significare. Ob id Leo Roma egressus Mantuam venit, & re cognita, ad Carolum scripsit.*

* Art. 8.

Thus the darkneſſe grew thicke, and the myſterie of iniquity ſtrengthened it ſelfe dayly more and more, the kings having no knowledge at all of the holy Scripture, and trembling under the Popes thunderbolts and excommunications, and powring abundance of wealth and riches into the boſome of the Clergie for the eaſing of their ſoules after death.

And for a full meaſure of miſchiefe, new Orders of Mendicant Friers did ſpring up, namely the *Franciſcans* and *Dominicans*, whereof *Francis Aſſiſian* in *Italy*, and *Dominick Calaroguenſis* in *Spaine* were the firſt Founders, in the yeare of our Lord 1216. and 1213. An incredible multitude of theſe Monks were dilated and ſpread over all the regions of the Popes Empire, who made uſe of them as of ſo many torches and trumpets for to provoke and encourage Princes to the perſecution of the faithfull. And it was the ſaid Monks that have coyned and forged the Schoole Divinity, all briſtled with pricks, and twiſted about with ſubtilties, much like unto the Cray-fiſh in which there is much picking, but little to eate. It is from this Divinity that ſuttle diſtinc-

ons

ons are drawne, wherewith they cover themselves against the truth. *Aristotle* is alleadged there a great deale oftner than the Apostle Saint *Paul*. Thus it behooved the mysterie of iniquitie should advance it selfe.

At the birth of these begging Friers, *Innocent* the third, in the yeare 1215. called a Councell at *Rome* in the *Lateran* Church, in which the word of Transubstantiation, not as yet received by any definition in the Roman Church, was established by an expresse Canon, and authority of Councell.

## CHAP. IX.

*Of the Judgement which the Doctors of the Romane Church doe make touching the apparitions, whereby a little Child, or a morsell of flesh hath appeared at the Masse in the hands of the Priest, and touching Christs blood that is kept in Reliques.*

A Long time hath beene that if one had doubted that a childe, or a peece of flesh that had appeared in a Priests hand, were not truely Christ, and that Christs blood that was kept in reliques, was not truely his blood, it would have beene an heresie deserving the fire, and a manifest impiety. The People did flock together for to worship this blood. Therefore *Guitmundus* in his third booke of the Sacrament, and *Paschasius* in his Booke of the body and blood of the Lord, Chapter 14. and *Iodocus Coccius* in his Collection of the places of the Fathers, and many others, doe

doe make use of these miraculous apparitions, for to prove Christs reall presence in the Eucharist.

*Thomas Aquinas* [a] in the third part of his Summe, question. 76. Art. 8. findes himselfe mightily pestred upon this point: For though hee teacheth that that which appeareth thus miraculously, ought to bee worshipped with the adoration of *Latria*, as Christ, and that Christ is there present: yet withall hee esteemes that sometimes these apparitions are not true, but onely in appearance, especially when the same thing appeares but to some and not to all. For which cause, *Cajetan* in his Annotations upon this place of *Aquinas*, departes from his opinion touching the Adoration, [b] and will have this blood or flesh that appeares sometimes in the Masse, to be worshipped, not as Christ: but as Christs garment, which is an inferiour adoration.

But the Jesuite *Vasquez* goes more plainely to worke, in his 193 Disput.

[a] Thom 3. part. q. 76. Art. 8. *Tali apparitione facta eadem reverentia exhibetur ei, quod apparet, quae etiam primo exhibebatur, quod quidem non sciret sive crederet non esse ibi Christum cui reverentiam latriae exhibemus.*

[b] Cajetan. in Notis. *hujusmodi*

*Si quaeratur qua adoratione venerandus esset sanguis miraculosus: dicendum idem esse judicium de ipso & de veste Christi.*

here

here bee his words. 'I answer that that which appeares, is not the flesh of Christ, nor of any other that bee truely flesh, but that it is onely an effigies or appearance of flesh, as Saint Thomas saith. And as touching the simple that are deceived, and beleeve that Christs flesh is there in a manner divisible and bloody, it matters not much. For that deception ought to bee corrected by the true instruction of the Doctors.

[a] Vasquez in 76. q. tertiæ par. Thomæ artic. 8. Disp. 193. cap. 2. Respondeo neque apparere carnem Christi, neque alterius, quæ revera caro sit, sed carnis solam effigiem, ut dixit S. Thomas, &c. Quod a. simplices decipiantur et credant ibi esse carnem Christi divisibili et cruento modo, parum refert: hæc enim deceptio instructione vera Doctorum corrigenda est. Potest fieri divina permissione illusione dæmonis ad decipiendum incautos. [b] Apparuit quidam in specie Angeli particulam apparenter porrigens, Apparuit stultus ora suscus de manu porrigentis apparentem hostiæ particulam: et continuo a diabolo obsessus est et graviter vexatus.

Gabriel Biel, a famous Doctor, in his 51 Lesson upon the Canon of the Masse, goes further, and saith that such apparitions of flesh and blood may bee done by illusion of the divell for to deceive the simple, God permitting it thus. And he brings an example of it: To wit that in the Countrey of Thuringe in the City of Tsenae in a Convent of Minorite Friers, [b] a certaine man in the likenesse of an Angel appeared to a Lay Brother preparing himselfe to the communion, who

chopt

chopt into his mouth a peece of flesh, which so soone as he had swallowed, he was possessed and grievously tormented by the devil.

And truely, those that esteeme that Christ appeareth truely upon the Altar in the forme of a childe or of a peece of flesh, and worship it, are very much puzled. For the *Roman* Church doth acknowledge but two sorts of Christs reall presence, the one naturall and visible after which he conversed with his Disciples here on earth: the other Sacramentall under the accidents of bread. But when these things doe appeare (yea if ever they doe appeare) Christ is neither present in the one, nor in the other manner. For he appeares neither under his owne proper accident, nor under the accidents of the bread. And it shall behoove one to beleeve that Christ is a child upon the Altar: Or that a perfect man is under the accidents of a child. That if it be onely a peece of flesh, we aske whether this peece of flesh be whole Christ: Or if it be but a part of his body, whether this portion or peece of flesh was taken out of the Arme or out of the Legge.

These things serve to make us to know how

how powerfull the seduction of Sathan hath beene, and with how much horrible darknesse he did envelope men in the Ages wherin this monster of Transubstantiation was formed. This latter age hath beene ashamed of it: for now we see no more the People run to *Mantua*, or to the *Billettes* Church at *Paris* for to worship the flesh and the blood of Christ that are there kept in reliques. The French Pilgrims passing by *Mantua* for to goe to *Rome*, stay there no more. They passe the *Pyrenean* Mountaines for to visit the supposed reliques of Saint *James*: but doe not goe into those places of *Spaine* where Christs blood is kept. That blood of Christ sent from *Syria* to King *Henry* the third of *England*, whereof I have spoken in the former Chapter, that putrified in a few dayes, lost instantly its credit, and there was no more speech of it.

CHAP. X.

## CHAP. X.

### *Of the corruption of the Papall Sea in the Ages wherein this errour was most advanced.*

IN the Eighth and Ninth Ages, were cast the first foundations of Transubstantiation; nevertheleſſe it was not yet then eſtabliſh d by Lawes: and I cannot finde that ever any man was molested for that subj &. But in the Tenth and Eleventh Ages, the Popes laboured to hatch that monſter, and to eſtabliſh it with authoritie. But God branded theſe two ages with infamous blemiſhes and diſgraces. For as vices agree well with errors, the Popes of thoſe times led ſuch an infamous life, that hardly the like is to be found in all Pagan hiſtories, and that Chaire was filled with horrible confuſions.

Since Pope *Formoſus* who in the yeare 890. attained to the Popedome by violating the oath hee had taken never to accept of it, and whoſe dead body was dragged

dragged ignominiously up and downe the City of *Rome* and cast into the *Tiber* by his Successors: for the space of a hundred and fifty yeares, yea of two hundred yeares, we see nothing in histories but of Popes murtherers, Popes Adulterers, necromanticall Popes, perjured Popes, Popes intruded by force or by money, creatures of the Earles of *Toscane*, that were then powerfull in *Italie*, and of the harlot *Theodora* and of her daughters *Marozia* and *Theodora*, that reigned a long time in *Rome*, and made and unmade Popes at their pleasure.

Of which time the Carmelite *Frier*, Author of *Fasciculus Temporum*, makes this lamentation: [t] *Alas, Alas, Alas, Lord God, how is the gold obscured and its good colour changed? O most wicked time in which the holy one is fallen away, and truth diminished among the sonnes of men.* And Cardinall *Baronius* after a long recitall of the vilanies of the Papall Sea in those times, he poures out these complaints, [u] *What was then the face of the Romane*

[t] *Heu, heu, heu, Domine Deus, quomodo obscuratum est aurum, mutatus est color optimus? O tempus pessimum! in quo defecit sanctus, et diminutæ sunt veritates a filiis hominum.*

[u] Baron. An. 912. §. 8. *Quæ tunc facies Ecclesiæ Romanæ? quam fœdissima? cum Romæ dominarentur potentissimæ sed fordidissimæ meretrices, quarum arbitrio mutarentur sedes, atque intruderentur in sedem Petri earum amasii Pseudopontifices.*

Church

*Church and how foule, when most powerfull and most filthie whores ruled and governed in* Rome, *by whose will the Seas were changed, and Bishopricks given away! And that which is horrible and not to be related, their Lovers, false Popes, were thrust in violently in* Peters *Chaire.* And *Genebrard*, a great worshipper of Popes, speakes of the same time, in the yeare 901. of his Chronicle, in these tearmes: *In that alone this age was unfortunate, that for the space almost of one hundred and fifty yeares, about fifty Popes have wholly fallen away from the vertue of their predecessors, being rather Apostaticall or Apostaticall, than Apostolicall. Sigonius* puts two hundred yeares in.

In the yeare of our Lord 931. *John* the eleventh, came to the Popedome. He was Bastard to Pope *Sergius* begotten on the body of the whore *Marozia*. Whereupon *Baronius* saith, *The Roman Church suffered her selfe to be so vilanously oppressed by such a monster.*

After him, there was many Popes that were creatures of the fornamed whores, even to *John* the XII. who in the yeare of our Lord 955. attained to the Papacie at eighteene yeares old, whom *Baronius* abhorres as an execrable monster.

*Luitprandus*

Luitprandus and *Fasciculus Temporum*, say, that this *John* being in bed with some bodies wife, was so beaten by the Devill that he died of it. This Pope made Children Bishops, dranke to the Devil, when he played at dice hee invocated *Jupiter* and *Venus*, and conferred the sacred Orders in a stable.

Luitprand. lib. 6. cap. 11. Sigeber. ad annum 963. Antoninus Chroni. Temo 11. Tract. 16. § 16.

Then, many Popes did play at thrust out, and cruelly persecuted one another, the Papacy was exposed to sale, and vices were there up to the roofe. *France*, though in an age full of darknesse, was mooved with it, and called a Councell at *Rheims* under the raigne of *Hugh Capet*, whose Acts we have extant. In that Councell, *Arnulphus* Bishop of *Orleans*, who presided there, speakes thus: [b] *O lamentable Rome, which in the time of our Auncestors hast brought forth bright shining lights, but now hast powred out such monstrous darknesses, that shall be infamous to future ages!* And a little after, *What thinke yee, Reverend Fathers, that the Pope is sitting upon a high throne, glistering in a robe of scarlet and gold? If hee hath no*

[b] *O lugenda Roma, quæ nostris majoribus clara patrum luminaprotulisti, nostris temporibus monstrosas tenebras futuris sæculis famosas effudisti! Quid hunc Reverendi Patres in sublimi solio residentem, veste purpurea & aurea radiantem, quid hunc esse censetis? Nimirum si charitate destitutus, solaque scientia inflatur & extollitur, Antichristus est in solio Dei residens, &c.*

charity

charity, if he doe exalt himselfe being puffed up with science alone, how is the Antichrist sitting in Gods throne. Then hee addes, that the Citie of Rome is exposed to sale, and that Antichrist is neare, and that the misterie of iniquitie goes forward.

In the yeare 984. * as *Sigonius* relates in the beginning of his seventh Booke of the Reigne of *Italy*, *Bonifacius*, who made himselfe to bee called *John* the fifteenth, having put to death two Popes, usurped the Papacie by violence and by money. *Baronius* calls him a Theefe and a Robber, and that had not one haire of a true Bishop. *Genebrard*, in the yeare 1007, speakes thus of all the Popes of that time. *The Popes* (saith hee) *of this time being intruded by the Emperours rather than elected, were monsters. Thus the lawfull succession hath beene troubled, as of old under the Synagogue in the time of the Kings* Antiochi.

* In *Baronius* it is the yeare 985.

In the yeare 1033. *Benedict* the ninth being but tenne yeares old, was created Pope by the faction of his Father the Counte of *Tuscula*. *Petrus Damianus* in his Epistle to *Nicolas* the second, and *Platina*, and *Fasciculus Temporum*, and

*Baronius*, describe this Pope like a monster. Then three Popes held the Papacy, of whō *Platina* speaks thus, *Henry the second being entred into Italie with a mightie Armie, and having called a Councell, constrained Benedict the ninth, Sylvester the third, and Gregory the sixth, as three horrible monsters, to forsake the magistrature.* That was done in the yeare of our Lord 1044. when the contention touching the conversion of the bread into the body of the Lord was in its strength, and *Berengarius* in great credit in *France* and in the neighbouring countries for his learning and good life.

Platina in Gregor. 6. *Henricus II. in Italiam cum magno exercitu veniens, habita Synodo, eō Benedictum IX Sylvestrum III. Gregorium VI. tanquā tria teterrima monstra se abdicare magistratu coegisset.*

The discreet Reader and lover of the truth, shal weigh & ponder these things in his minde, and say in himselfe, Is it credible that God would have used such wicked instruments for to defend his heavenly truth? Could any good thing spring from such wicked Popes? Are not those such Ages as Sathan desireth for to bring forth monsters in, & in the mids of so thicke a darknes to bring in Idolatry?

CHAP.

## CHAP. XI.

*Of the oppression of England. How Religion passed out of England into Bohemia. Of Wicklef, John Huz, and Hierome of Prague. Of the Councell of Constance. Of Ziska and Procopius, and of their Victories.*

I Hope the Reader shall not dislike to take here a short view of the History of the troubles which hapned in *Bohemia* about Religion, a little before God made the light of his Gospell to shine againe in *France*, *England*, *Germanie*, *Switzerland* and the Low-Countries. For in it may be seene a lively Image of Satan, and of the power of God.

Of all Countries subject to the Papall Empire, *England* suffered the hardest and most shamefull servitude. That slavery increased especially under the reigne of *Henry* the second, and of *John* and *Henry* the third. In the yeare 1171. Math. Paris in Henrico I. An. 1171.

King *Henry* the ſecond for to expiate the crime whereof hee was accuſed, namely to have cauſed the murther of *Thomas* Arch-Biſhop of *Canterburie*, was whipt upon his naked fleſh by a multitude of Monkes, ſome giving him three ſtripes and ſome five. With the like effeminatneſſe that King yeelded up to the Pope the Inveſtures of Benefices, which the Kings his predeceſſors had poſſeſſed till that time.

That King being dead in the yeare 1189. had for Succeſſor *Richard* his ſon, and after him *John*, a King brutiſh and furious, who made ſome attempts to recover the Inveſtures which his Father had yeelded up to the Pope. But being hated and contemned of his ſubjects, Pope *Innocent* the third had a faire way to handle him ill. He did declare him to have loſt the right of his Kingdome, diſpenſed his ſubjects from their Oath of allegiance, a thing never ſeene nor heard of before in *England*, cauſed Divine Service to ceaſe throughout all the Kingdom, and Churches and Churchyards to be ſhut up: Which continued by the ſpace of ſix yeares and a halfe. He alſo excommunicated the King, and gave the Kingdome of *England* to *Philip*

*Auguſtus*

*Augustus* King of *France*, upon condition to Conquer the same at his owne perill and fortune: and that for the remission of his owne sinnes.

That constrained King *John* to yeeld up his Kingdome to the Pope, and to binde himselfe to doe homage unto him for his crowne. So hee made himselfe the Popes vassall, and *England* became Saint *Peters* patrimonie. And a Patent with a golden seale was made and framed, by which the King did oblige himselfe and his successors for ever, to pay yearely unto the Pope a thousand marks in gold, in signe of subjection, besides Saint *Peters* moneys that were paid by polle. Unto which that poore King was forced to adde an Oath, whereby hee swore that hee was induced so to doe without constraint and of his owne accord, and by the motion of the holy Spirit: and that for the remission of his sinnes.

Vnder this slaverie died this King in the yeare of our Lord 1216. to whom succeeded *Henrie* the third, who did put his Crowne at the Legats feete, one knee upon the ground, doing homage unto him for his Kingdome.

Then did the Pope beginne to send his Legats, who skimmed *England* of money by a thousand kindes of devices. The Orders of the *Franciscans* and *Jacobins* were newly instituted. The same Friers preached the Croisado, whereby the Pope promised the remission of all sinnes, and a degree of glorie in heaven above the common sort, to all those which being arm'd, would make the vow to goe to the holy Land for the recovering of Christs Sepulcher, possessed by the *Sarrasins*. At these Predications every one crossed himselfe with a crosse upon the shoulder, and a great multitude of Gentry and people sold and morgaged their Lands and estates for the charges of that Journey. But as they were armed and furnished for the journey, another Legate would come that dispensed the English from their vow, and gave them the same graces and Indulgences without budgeing from their owne houses, provided they would give to the Pope as much money as was necessary to have beene spent in their journey. By these meanes this Legate gathered huge summes of money. And that money was employed by the Pope for to conquer the Cities and Provinces

which the Emperour had in *Italy*. Thus did the Pope inlarge his limits.

Never a yeare came over head but hungry Italians came over into *England* with new Commissions to raise moneyes, with power to excommunicate all such as would refuse, and put the Churches into interdict. What good horses soever there were, or curious houshold stuffe, or fine wares in shops, were conveyed away without paying for, and carried into *Italy*. The Exactors tooke up the tithes of the corne yet unsowen. The *Italians* possessed in *England* the best Benefices. The Pope called *England* his garden of pleasure and his bottomlesse treasure. Whereupon great clamours arose among the People. The Nobles said: *These are the successors of* Constantine, *and not of* Peter. *O shamefull thing! rascally ruffians that know not what armes and honour is, will domineere over all the World by their excommunications.* The Monkes in the Countrey did say, *The Daughter of Sion is become a brasen faced Whore, and without shame at all, through the just judgement of him, who because of the sins of the People makes an Hypocrite to raigne, and a Tyrant to governe and rule.* But

Matth. Paris pag. 267. Marxidiribaldi.

Matth Paris pag. 423.

all these clamours were unprofitable and without effect, because the holie Scripture was a Booke then altogether unknowne amongst the English people. They spake of nothing but of Miracles, and of Images, and of Pilgrimages, and of Reliques: Vntill such time as an English Doctor and Preacher named *John Wickleff*, fell to preaching and writing openly against the Pope, and against the Masse, about the yeare of our Lord 1370. Hee was listened unto with great applause, and was able to have caused a great alteration in England, if the King would have given way to it. Of this oppression in England, *Matthew Paris* and *Westmonasterienſis*, English Monks that lived in those dayes, wrote strange and prodigious things.

Æneæ Sylvii Hist. Bohem.

Now as *John Wickleff* was a teaching, it fell out that a *Bohemian* Gentleman, who was a student of Oxford, did taste and relish *Wickleffs* Doctrine, and coppied out his Bookes, which he carryed over into his owne Country, and imparted them to *John Huz*, a famous Preacher, to whom *Wenceslaus* King of *Bohemia*, brother to *Sigismond* Emperour, had committed the govern-

ment

ment of the Schoole of *Prague*, renowned at that time.

This *John Huz*, overcome by the evidence of *Wickleffs* reasons, fell a preaching his doctrine, and being a vehement and perswasive man, he drew after him a great number of People. To whom *Hierome* of *Prague* did adjoyne himselfe, who surpassed *John Huz* in eloquence and learning. There came also out of *Germanie* one *Petrus Dresdensis*, and one *Jacobellus* that spake with vehemencie against Transubstantiation, and against the Communion under the onely species of the bread.

For to appease these stirres and commotions, the Arch-Bishop of *Prague*, called *Subineo Cepus*, caused *Wickleffs* Bookes publickly to bee burned, and drove out *John Huz* from *Prague*: But seeing the number of those that he called hereticks did encrease dayly, he himselfe fled into *Hongaria* towards *Sigismond*: and *John Huz* returned back to *Prague*.

Then *Benedict* the thirteenth, & *Gregory* the twelfth, excommunicated one another, the one having his seat at *Anignon*, & the other at *Rome*. A Councell was kept at *Pisa* in the yeare 1409. in which they

created

created a third Pope, to wit, *Alexander* the fifth, who dying shortly after, *John* XXIII. succeeded him. So there was then three Popes all at once, and there was no body in all the Church of *Rome* but was excommunicated by some one of these Popes.

This *John* had warre against *Ladislaus* King of *Naples*: and for to strengthen and fortifie himselfe against him, he sent Preachers abroad over all the Countries of his obedience to preach the Croisadoe, whereby hee promised the forgivenesse of all sinnes to all those that would take up Armes against *Ladislaus* for the defense of the Church.

This Indulgence being published at *Prague*, many of the people beganne to say aloud and openly, that it was indeed the language of Antichrist, that promised salvation to those that should spill the Christian blood. At which the Magistrate of *Prague* being angry, hee layd hands on some of them and clapped them up into prison. But the people gathered themselves together and demanded of the Magistrate the release of these prisoners: who fearing an uproare, appeased the people with milde words, promising that no harme or wrong

should

should be done unto them: But so soon as this multitude was separated, the Magistrate caused these prisoners to be stabbed with a dagger or ponard in the prison: so that the blood ran out in such abundance that it streamed into the very street. At the sight of that blood the people being provoked to wrath and fury, they caused the Prison doores to be opened unto them, and conveyed away the dead corpses, and carried them from Church to Church, crying aloude, *These are the faithfull ones that have exposed their bodies for the Covenant of God.* The King did consider these things without being much moved at it.

But the Emperour *Sigismund* desiring to remedy the disorders of the *Papacie*, and by the same meanes to pacifie the troubles of *Bohemia*, did in such sort by his going and comming and bestirring himselfe too and fro, that a Councell was called and kept at *Constance*, a City of *Suaube* in *Germanie*, in the yeare 1414. wherein the three forenamed Popes were degraded; especially *John* XXIII. for having (among other things laid to his charge) * maintained openly and obstinately that the soules

* *Concil. Constant. Sess.* XI.

soules of men die as the soules of beasts, and that there is neither Heaven nor Hell.

In these three Popes roome was chosen in the Councell *Martin* the fifth, to whom the Emperour *Sigismund* kneeled downe before the whole Councell, kissed his feet, and worshipped him. This *Martin* sent some Embassadors to *Constantinople*, to whom hee gave instructions that begin thus: *The most holy and most blessed, who hath the heavenly Empire, who is Lord on Earth, successor of S. Peter, the Christ of the Lord, the Master of the Universall World, the Father of Kings, the Light of the World, the most high and Soveraigne Bishop*, Martin *by the divine providence, commandeth unto Master* Anthonie Masson, &c. These instructions are inserted in the Councell of *Sena*, held a little after, Printed at *Paris* in the yeare 1612.

*Sanctissimus et beatissimus, qui habet cœleste arbitrium, qui est Dominus in terris, successor Petri, Christus Dei Domini, Dominus universi, Regũ pater, orbis lumen, &c.*

At the same Councell of *Constance* *John Huz* and *Hierome* of *Prague* were called for to conferre of their doctrine: they shewed some unwillingnesse to meet thither, fearing some ill usage. But the Emperour assured them, and gave them, by the advice of the Councell, a large safe conduct, whereby he did

did promise they should receive no harme there, but might with all liberty and freedome propound their reasons, and after that returne home in all safety.

Grounded upon the Emperours faith and promise, they resorted to the Councel and propounded their reasons. They spake chiefly of the Communion under both kinds. But the Fathers of the Councell, perceiving they would not yeeld to that which was enjoyned unto them, concluded that they should be burned alive. The Emperour made some difficulty in it, saying he had obliged his faith unto them, and that they came under his promise. Thereupon, that the Emperours conscience might be at quiet, * the Councell framed a Canon, wherein is declared and defined, that faith must not be kept unto hereticks, after men have done what they can for to convert them; and that a Prince is not bound to keepe what hee hath promised them. This Sentence being pronounced to *Johu Huz*, he appealed to Christ Jesus.

They were then executed publickly. And *Æneas Sylvius*, who afterward was Pope, and made himselfe to bee called

* This Canon by which is defined that one is not bound to keepe faith with hereticks, is to be seene in the 19 Session of the Councel of Constance.

called *Pius* the second, speakes thus of them in the 36 chapter of his Historie of *Bohemia*; * *Both of them suffered death with a constant courage, and made haste to goe to the fire, as if they had been invited to a feast, without hearing any word come from them that shewed or testified any sorrowfulnesse of minde. When they beganne to burne, they fell a singing of an Hymne, which could hardly be hindred by the violence and noyse of the flames. No Philosopher ever suffered death with such magnanimitie as these indured burning.* Then he alleadgeth an Epistle of *Poggius*, a *Florentine*, that describeth the death of *Hierome* of *Prague*, who was put to death some dayes after *John Huz*. In that Epistle *Poggius* speakes as one that was present at the examination and death of the sayd *Hierome*. *I confesse* (saith he) *I never saw any body, who in a cause altogether criminall, came nearer the eloquence of the Ancients. It was an admirable thing to see with what words, what eloquence, what arguments, what countenance, what confidence, hee answered his Adversaries*, and that too, after he had beene three hundred and forty dayes in a deepe and stinking dungeon. Then he relates afterwards how a list of he-

* *Pertulerunt ambo constanti animo necẽ, & quasi ad epulas invitati ad incendium properarũt, nullam emittentes vocem quæ miseriarum esset indicium. Vbi ardere cœperunt, hymnum cecinere, &c.*

resies

reſies that were laid to his charge, was read unto him, and that upon everie head or point he anſwered in ſuch ſort, as hee did ſhew they were calumnies laid upon him, ſaying he beleeved nothing of all that. And being brought to the place of puniſhment, and compaſſed round about with faggots and ſtraw, hee fell a ſinging of an Hymne or Pſalme. The Executioner drawing neare for to kindle the fire behind him, he ſaid unto him, *Friend, come neere, put the fire here before mee, for if I did feare the fire, I would not bee here.* The aſhes of theſe Martyrs were caſt into the Lake of *Conſtance*, for to aboliſh the memory of them.

In this Councell was framed a Canon, whereby thoſe are declared hereticks, and puniſhable by the ſecular power, who for conforming themſelves unto Chriſt and unto the Ancient Church, will have the people to receive the Sacrament under both kindes. Seſſion XII.

There alſo was condemned *Wickleſs* doctrine, to whom in that Councell are falſly attributed impious doctrines, and which never came into his minde. For example, *That God ought to obey the Devill. That a Prince is no lawfull maſter, while*

while he is in a mortall sinne. And that it belongs to the people to chastise their Lords.

In the like manner was handled *John Huz*, whose doctrine was condemned by the Councell of *Constance*, in the fifteenth Session. To whom also they did impute things farre from his beleefe. Some witnesses presented themselves that testified they had heard him say, *That the Pardons of the Pope, and of the Bishop, are nothing worth, unlesse God doe forgive:* That was one of the crimes for which he was burned. For that venerable Councell hath judged that the Pope may forgive sinnes whether God will or no, and that Gods consent is not necessarily required for to make that the Popes and Bishops Indulgences be of force and validity.

*Sess. XV. Artic. 19. Dixerant se audivisse quod Iohannes Hus dixisset, quod indulgentiæ Papæ & Episcopi nõ valent nisi Deus indulgeat.*

This newes of *John Huz* his death, and of *Hierome* of *Prague*, brought into *Bohemia*, did pierce the heart of the *Bohemians* that were called *Hussites*, with exceeding griefe. The King seeing their number encrease dayly more and more, granted them Churches in *Prague* for their meetings. *Æneas Sylvius* saith, that the people mooved with anger, pulled downe some Monasteries and Churches both

*Histor. Bohemicæ cap. 36.*

both within and without the City. Namely, neere *Tabor*, where thirty thousand persons did celebrate in the middest of a field the holy Communion under both kindes.

The King *Wenceslaus* being dead, the Kingdome of *Bohemia* fell to *Sigismund* his brother, Emperor and King of *Hungaria*. Whereupon great feare did seise the people of *Bohemia*, because of his great power, and that against his oath, and violating the safe conduct he had given to *John Huz* and to *Hierome* of *Prague*, he caused them to be burned at *Constance*.

But a *Bohemian* Gentleman called *Ziska*, that had lost an eye in the warres, a man incomparable for vigour of body and minde, exhorted them not to be discouraged. And it fell out at the same time, that *Sigismund* undertooke warre against the Turke in *Hungaria*, with an indifferent bad successe.

That gave leasure to the people to order their businesses. The Queene, widdow to *Wenceslaus*, levied some troopes for to fall upon this people, and hinder their encreasing. *Sigismund* sent Lievtenants to governe the Country, and set things into good order againe, in whose

hands *Ziſca* did ſurrender and remit *Pelzino* and *Pleſta*, and other places whereof he had gotten poſſeſſion. For his deſire was to obey the Emperour, and he ſought all meanes to give him content. But there came Letters from the Emperour, whereby he did declare that his will and pleaſure was that the Churches granted to the *Bohemians* called *Huſſites*, ſhould bee taken from them, and their Religion interdicted. And they had good advice that *Sigiſmonds* intention was to deſtroy them. Whereat the People being afraid, looked for nothing but for a totall ruine: and their enemies being become more vigorous, beganne to oppreſſe them. Which things moved *Ziſca* to take Armes, and thinke upon his defence. With a few forces hee obtained many victories againſt the Queene, having none but foote forces of ſmall experience, and little exerciſed in warre.

Cap. 39.

Then came *Sigiſmond* into *Bohemia* with a mighty Armie, reſolved to deſtroy this people: Beſieged *Pragne*, wherein *Ziſca* was, who in many ſallies defeated the moſt part of *Sigiſmonds* armie: made him raiſe the Siege,

and

and tooke many townes by the verie terrour of his name. As hee was beseiging *Wissegrad*, the Emperour came at unawares for to make him raise the siege, having with him thirtie thousand Horse, and all the Nobility of *Moravia*. But *Zisca* defeated him, and obtained upon him a great victorie. And a little after, *Sigismond* having for the third time prepared a mightie Armie, lost a third Battell, by which he was constrained to leave *Bohemia*, full of shame and confusion.

A little after *Zisca* beseiging a towne, Cap. 44.
received a shot of an arrow in the eye, so that of blinde of an eye as hee was, hee became blinde of both. But that hindred him not from leading and conducting his troopes, and giving many combates, being victorious every where.

But the Emperour being irritated and angrie, came backe againe into *Bohemia*, bringing along with him two powerfull Armies, the one out of *Germanie*, and the other out of *Hungaria*, which like an overflowing torrent, overwhelmed all *Bohemia*: Tooke some townes, and made great

ravage. But *Ziſca*, though blinde and having but a few men, drew directly towards the Emperours Armie, and defeated him with a great defeat, tooke Bag and Baggage and all things belonging to the Armie, and purſued him a whole dayes journey. *Pio* a *Florentine* had brought out of *Hungaria* fifteene thouſand horſe, who paſſing upon a frozen River for to ſave themſelves, the Ice breaking under them, were all drowned in the River.

Furthermore, *Ziſca* with his victorious Armie went out of *Bohemia*, and entred into *Moravia*, and paſſed into *Auſtria*, and came to ſuccour the faithfull that were oppreſſed there. To him did adjoyne himſelfe a *Moravian* gentleman named *Proxopius*, exceeding valiant, and an imitator of the vertue of *Ziſca*, who cauſed the Emperour *Sigiſmund* to raiſe the ſiege before *Intemberg* in *Moravia*, which he had beſieged. A great Battell was given betweene *Ziſca* and the Emperours troopes neare *Auſck*, upon the River of *Elba*, where a great quantity of the Germane Gentry were killed on the Emperours ſide. Who, pulled downe

and

and confounded with so many losses, resolved at last to seeke after *Ziscs* his love and friendship, promising him the Generall Lievetenancy of the whole Kingdome, and all kinde of Advantages. *Ziscs* gave eare thereunto, and took his journey for to goe meet the Emperour; but hee fell sicke by the way and dyed, being very old, and blinde. *Æneas Sylvius* saith, that when hee was a dying, he gave counsell to his people to make a Drumme of his skinne after his death, assuring them that at the sound of that Drumme, his enemies would flie away. Cap. 46.

*Ziscs* being dead, *Procopius* succeeded him in the conduct of a part of the troopes, against whom Pope *Martin* the fifth set all *Germanie* in Armes, and sent into *Bohemia* three mighty Armies, commanded by the Dukes of *Saxe*, the Marqueſſe of *Brandenbourg*, and the Arch-Bishop of *Trivers*. These three Armies joyned themselves together. But so soone as the Bohemians did appeare, such terrour and feare seised upon the Imperiall Armies, that they presently fled without staying for the enemie: forsaking all their baggage and munitions of warre. But the Cardinal *Julian*,

sent by the Pope, stirred up the Emperour *Sigismond* to make a greater effort than any of the former. *Aneas Sylvius* saith there was in his Armie forty thousand Horse besides the Foot. This Cardinall entred into *Bohemia*, where hee committed many unheard off cruelties, killing both women and children. But at the very first noyse and rumbour that came of the *Bohemians* approach, such a terrible feare tooke this huge Armie, that every one threw his armes downe for to fly away more nimbly, and left their carriage and munitions of warre to the enemy.

The Cardinall having escaped this danger, came to *Basile* for to preside at the Councell that the Pope *Eugenius* the fourth had assembled there, in the yeare of our Lord, 1431.

Now we have made this recitall, not for to approve *Zise*s his actions, nor the commotions of peoples taking armes against their Soveraigne for to avoide persecution and Martyrdom; For the truth of the Gospell is not established by these meanes; Christ Jesus calleth us to beare the crosse after him; The blood of Martyrs hath more efficacy for to encrease the Church and spread the doctrin

of the Gospell, than Battels; But I have represented this history, for to be an example of Gods justice, punishing the disloyalty of *Sigismond*, who against his faith and promise burned alive two faithfull Martyrs, God having made use of weake and contemptible persons for to make him lose above two hundred thousand men, and cover him with shame and confusion.

## CHAP. XII.

## CHAP. XII.

### *The Confession of* Cyril *Patriarch of Constantinople, now living, touching the Sacrament of the Eucharist.*

THis Prelate, in the seventeenth Article of his Confession, altogether conformable to the Doctrine of our Churches, after he hath recited the Institution of the holy Supper as it is found in the Gospell, addeth: *That is the simple, true, and lawfull Institution of this admirable Sacrament, in the administration whereof wee doe confesse and beleeve the true and firme presence of the Lord Christ Jesus: Yet that presence which faith offereth and makes present unto us: but not that which Transubstantiation vainely invented, doth teach: For wee beleeve that the faithfull, in the holy Supper, doe eate the body of Christ Jesus our Lord, not in crushing and breaking it sensibly, and destroying it with our teeth, in the participation: But in partaking thereof by the sense of*

of the soule. For the body of Christ is not that which is taken and seene in the Sacrament with the eyes, but that which Faith having taken spiritually makes it present and communicates it unto us. Therefore it is true, that we eate it, and are made partakers of it, if we doe believe: But if we believe not, we fall away from all the benefit of the Sacrament. By the same reason we believe that to drinke the Cup in the Sacrament, it is drinke indeed the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, after the same manner as hath been said concerning the body. For the Lawgiver made the same commandement touching his blood, as he did touching his body. Which precept must not be mutilated, according to every ones fancie and humour: But the tradition that hath beene prescribed unto us, must be kept sound and entire. When therefore in the Sacrament wee have partaked worthily, and communicated intirely with the body and blood of Christ, we make this profession, that we are already reconciled and united to our head, and made one and the selfe same body, with a firme hope that we shall be his coheires in his Kingdome.

Here

## Here is the Originall in Greek.

Α τῇ ἐσχατῃ ἀπλότητι καὶ γνησιότητι τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν τοιοῦτον παράδοσιν, ἅπερ ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ βεβαίου περιποιήσεως τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁμολογοῦμεν καὶ πεπιστεύκαμεν. σκοπὸν ἦν ἐσχε ἡμῖν περίκοπη καὶ σκοπὸν φέρει, ἐχ ἵνα ἡ ἀφορμὴ δοθεῖσα εἰκῆ ἀλλότριοι μετασχήσωσι. Πιστεύομεν γὰρ καὶ σπεύδομεν μεταλαμβάνοντας ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐλθεῖν, ἐκ αἰδοῦσας τοῖς ὀδοῦσι τρυχόντας καὶ σκανδαλίσοντας τὴν μετάληψιν, ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ Ἁγίου αἰδοῖ κατασθέντας. τὸ γὰρ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου ἐκ ἔστι ὀφὴ ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁρᾶσθαι καὶ μεταλαμβάνεσθαι ἀλλ' ὅπερ πνευματικῶς ἡ πίστις ἀκούσει ἡμῖν παρίστανε τι καὶ χωρίζει. ὅθεν ἀληθὴς ἔστι ἐσθίειν ἡμᾶς καὶ μετέχειν καὶ κοινωνοὺς εἶναι, ἐὰν σπεύδωμεν ἐαν ἡ σπεύδωμεν, πάντως ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ κυρίου ἀσίτους εὑρήσεται. Ἀκαλύπτως τὸ πιστεύειν πίνειν ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ, ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα πίνειν ἀληθῶς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃν ὕπον καὶ σὰρ τοῦ σώματος εἴρηκε). Ὁ γὰρ νομοθέτης οὐκ σὰρ τοῦ σώματος ἦν ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ καὶ σὰρ ἦν ἀλλ' αἵματος ἐνετείλατο. ἵνα ἐντελὴ ἡ δίκη καὶ δικαίαν ἀφέσιν καλοῦσθαι, ἀλλὰ σὺν αἵματι ἦν νομοθετήσας παράδοσιν. ὅπερ ἐν ἀξίως μεθέξωμεν καὶ ὁλοκλήρως κοινωνήσωμεν ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἔστω ἡμᾶς ἡδὺ ἐμφαγεῖν ἀλλαγμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ ἡμῶν καὶ πρωτύπους καὶ συσκημένους, μὴ βαρείας ἀλλήλοις, καὶ συγκλειστέους ἔσεσθαι ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ.

BRITISH 12 MY 1908 MUSEUM

FINIS.